THE LIVING AGE

CONTENTS

for May 1, 1930

Articles

BRITAIN IN INDIA ..... *Mahatma Gandhi* 264
GERMANY COMES BACK ..... *Gaston Raphaël* 270
LABOR IN OFFICE ..... *W. J. Brown* 278
HINDENBURG AND LUTHER ..... *Two German Correspondents* 282
AN IRISHMAN ON IRELAND ..... *Stephen Gwynn* 292
SCHOBER OF AUSTRIA ..... *Marcel Dunan* 295
FORD THROUGH GERMAN EYES ..... *Ernst Toller* 299
FERRERO FOR DEMOCRACY ..... *G. Hubert-Rodier* 304
THE NEW PAPAL INDEX ..... *G. G. Coulton* 307

Departments

THE WORLD OVER 257
LETTERS AND THE ARTS 289
AS OTHERS SEE US 315
WAR AND PEACE 318

THE LIVING AGE. Published semi-monthly, on the first and the fifteenth of each month. Publication office, 10 FERRY STREET, CONCORD, N. H. Editorial and General offices, 253 Broadway, New York City. 25c a copy. $6.00 a year. Foreign postage, except Canada, $1.00. Entered as second class matter at the Post Office at Concord, N. H., under the Act of Congress, March 3, 1879
Copyright, 1930, by The Living Age Company, New York, New York.

THE LIVING AGE was established by E. Littell, in Boston, Massachusetts, May, 1844. It was first known as LITTELL'S LIVING AGE, succeeding *Littell's Museum of Foreign Literature*, which had been previously published in Philadelphia for more than twenty years. In a prepublication announcement of LITTELL'S LIVING AGE, in 1844, Mr. Littell said: 'The steamship has brought Europe, Asia, and Africa into our neighborhood; and will greatly multiply our connections as Merchants, Travelers, and Politicians, with all parts of the world: *so that much more than ever, it now becomes every intelligent American to be informed of the condition and changes of foreign countries.*'

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE GUIDE POST

RECENT EVENTS HAVE clearly proved that as a leader of the masses Mahatma Gandhi has no living peer. He has caught the imagination not only of India's 'dumb millions,' as he calls them, but of the whole civilized world, where miracles such as he has wrought seem strangely out of place. His letter to the Viceroy of India, announcing his campaign of civil disobedience, appeared in full only in his own paper, *Young India*, and it ought to explain, if any words can, the extraordinary prestige he enjoys.

In spite of her apparent revival, Germany is passing through a precarious period. Gaston Raphaël shows that the highly perfected industrial machine that the country has developed since the War must be kept busy or it will go to smash. And with every other nation in the world—including these United States—protecting native industries it is hard to see where Germany will find markets. All of which does not make things any easier for the American investor whose interest extends equally to German loans and to home-grown products.

OPEN REVOLT has broken out in the British Labor Party as a result of the Government's failure to remedy unemployment. W. J. Brown, a Laborite Member of Parliament, asserts that MacDonald is the English Kerenski and that after Kerenski comes Lenin. Incidentally, the *New Leader*, in which this article appeared, is the mouthpiece of the Independent Labor Party, a left-wing group from which the Prime Minister resigned a few weeks ago.

Georg Bernhard, editor of the *Vossische Zeitung*, applauds President Hindenburg for having openly defended the Young Plan and then shows how the office that the former Field Marshal holds has come to acquire its present unique prestige. René Kraus, Berlin correspondent of the *Pester Lloyd*, follows up Herr Bernhard's appreciation of Hindenburg with a sketch of Hans Luther, new President of the Reichsbank and successor in office to Dr. Schacht.

Stephen Gwynn served with the Sixteenth Irish Division in France and has written copious books and magazine articles on Ireland, including an authoritative history of his native land published in 1923. Although the present position of Ireland can hardly be described as brilliant, it is apparently a less distressful country than it used to be.

THANKS LARGELY to the efforts of Chancellor Schober, Austria emerged from the Second Hague Conference a free country in fact as well as in name. One result of this emancipation is that a new element has been introduced into European diplomacy and Vienna is beginning to develop a series of alliances and trade agreements that will produce international consequences.

Although Ernst Toller was sent to jail some years ago for his revolutionary opinions, the eminently respectable *Berliner Tageblatt* had no scruples about running his opinions of the Ford plant, based as they were on a personal visit. As an expressionist poet and dramatist of the latest model, Herr Toller naturally has a few faults to find with the way they order things in Detroit.

GUGLIELMO FERRERO belongs to that noble body of Italians who live in voluntary exile. Yet his views on democracy are by no means gloomy. One of his Parisian friends outlines his general philosophy of progress, dwelling particularly on the horrors of democratic war, which is much more terrible than the warfare of former times because everyone participates.

G. G. Coulton is a fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and the author of many books on mediæval history and religion. He has studied in both France and Germany and has more than once broken lances with defenders of the Roman Catholic faith. On the present occasion he analyzes the new papal *Index of Forbidden Books* and has many pertinent things to say on the much discussed subject of literary censorship.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LIVING AGE

Founded by E. Littell

In 1844

May 1, 1930 *Volume 338, Number 4361*

The World Over

DISSENSION BETWEEN the extremist and moderate elements in the British Labor Party has been irking the MacDonald Government for some time, but the fundamental nature of this conflict has only just been revealed in full detail. What did the trick was the memorandum on unemployment submitted confidentially to the Cabinet by Sir Oswald Mosley, Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancashire. As the son-in-law of Lord Curzon and an aristocrat in his own right as well, Sir Oswald is regarded as something of a renegade now that he has become one of the most influential and intransigent Laborites in the House of Commons. His present proposal attacks Mr. J. H. Thomas's notion that unemployment can be cured through foreign trade and advocates instead the creation of a National Planning Council with full powers to carry out long- and short-term schemes of work. The state would make itself responsible for the unemployed, mobilizing them and setting them to work on public enterprises at public expense. The scheme would be financed by a national loan whose amount would depend on the quantity of work decided upon by the Council. Mr. W. J. Brown's article on 'Labor in Office' that appears elsewhere in this issue contains many of the theories that underlie Sir Oswald's memorandum, but it is necessarily less specific.

Stimulation of the home market rather than cultivation of foreign trade is put forward as the only sure solution of present difficulties. Imports must be reduced until they come somewhere near to balancing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exports. The potential production power of the country must be estimated. Agriculture must be encouraged and the farmer protected from foreign competition by a National Import Board that would buy abroad only what the nation could not produce for itself. The Planning Council would also make itself responsible for rationalizing industry and the public-utility idea would be extended to include all basic productive activities; in short, England is being called upon to trade as a nation instead of as a group of isolated individuals. Orthodox Tories look upon these suggestions as if they were literally the ravings of an irresponsible lunatic, quite forgetting that there is a tradition of British loyalty quite as strong as the tradition of economic individualism that they are so zealously defending. Sir Oswald Mosley's task is to convince the country that the place to bear the white man's burden is in the home.

NO NEWSPAPER in London is in the habit of showing a more consistent understanding of the American point of view in world affairs than the Conservative *Daily Telegraph*. The ostensible friendliness of the *Times* and of the Liberal press frequently falters, but the *Telegraph*, perhaps because it makes no special claim of cultivating Anglo-American good-fellowship, always maintains a scrupulously correct attitude. During the Naval Conference, however, a point was reached at which even the *Telegraph's* affability gave way and its diplomatic correspondent, probably the best informed London journalist in his field, expressed irritation at the behavior of the American delegates and set forth the unmistakable determination of Great Britain not to get further involved abroad. 'An interesting view,' he wrote, 'held in some unusually enlightened diplomatic quarters was expressed yesterday. It might be summed up in a single sentence. America, fearing the price she would have to pay Japan for the latter's participation in a three-power pact would be too high, would prefer to such a pact a five-power one, for which Great Britain would have to pay the French price—in a pact of guarantees.' The same dispatch concludes as follows: 'It is a little strange that the official representatives of the United States —which is not a member of the League—should venture to interpret for our benefit the provisions of the League Covenant.'

The anxiety of even so kindly a critic arises from the complicated international position of Great Britain. First and foremost England must guard her own interests, protect her Empire, reduce taxation. But she is a world power, too, and in that capacity must play a double rôle. She must maintain the best of relations and, if possible, a working agreement with America, the other great world power, and she must also as a neighbor of Europe's mingle more or less intimately in Euro-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pean affairs. At the Naval Conference British statesmanship has been torn in three directions at once and the outburst in the *Daily Telegraph* shows what happens when her interests in one field, the American, conflict with her European policy and her own security.

EXPRESSIONS OF HIGH OPTIMISM greeted the party of Egyptian delegates who have come to London to negotiate a final treaty with Mr. Henderson. Four topics are engaging their attention: the security of British imperial communications, the defense of Egypt against foreign aggression, the protection of foreigners living in Egypt, and the control of the Sudan. As long ago as last summer, Mr. Henderson drew up with the fallen Liberal leader, Mahmud Pasha, a draft treaty which was promptly handed on to Nahas Pasha, Nationalist leader and head of the present delegation, and which embodies 'the extreme limit' in the way of concessions that His Majesty's Government is prepared to make. It involves moving the British garrison from Cairo to the Canal Zone, it places protection of foreigners entirely in the hands of the Egyptians, it puts the Sudan back to the 'codominion status' that it occupied up to 1899 and further provides that the British governor general shall exercise his powers there in behalf of both parties equally. Britain also undertakes to protect Egypt from foreign attack and Egypt agrees to furnish all possible assistance to Great Britain in case of war in any quarter and also undertakes not to enter any arrangement with a third power prejudicial to British interests. The *Morning Post* is almost alone in expressing alarm, taking the ground that Mr. Henderson has made the fatal mistake of announcing all his concessions in advance instead of bargaining in the time-honored Oriental fashion. However, the control of the Sudan which England will retain and which really means the control of Egypt's water supply makes the situation much less perilous than the die-hards profess to believe that it is.

THERE IS EVERY INDICATION that the parties of the left in France are gaining strength all the time. In spite of the brief, inglorious career of the Chautemps Cabinet, its very existence showed that Tardieu is only holding office on sufferance, and two recent contests for seats in the Chamber of Deputies reveal that the public is turning away from the more reactionary candidates. The most disturbing event was the election of the Communist, Doriot, from the Saint Denis arrondissement of the Seine. The French electoral system stipulates that if no one candidate receives a clear majority over the entire field, the two candidates receiving the largest number of votes contest the seat between them one week after the first balloting has occurred. In this case the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Socialists, whose man finished third, cast their votes for Doriot, who divides his time between urging the French Army to revolt and meditating upon his heresies in jail. In another election in the Eure-et-Loir department, the Radical candidate, who came out a good third, urged his supporters to vote for his Socialist rival in preference to the member of one of the Centre groups who had run a very close second. This condition of affairs disturbs the reactionary *Journal des Débats:*—

> The plan of the Socialist Party has long been clear. It consists in swallowing up the Radical Party by conquering a large portion of its followers and thus winning more seats. When it has succeeded in this manœuvre—and experience shows that it is working energetically—it will be the strongest advanced party in Parliament. The Radicals will only form one element in a parliamentary group dominated by the Socialists.

As we recently pointed out in these columns, the refusal of the Radicals and the Socialists to work together has been the chief obstacle blocking the formation of a predominantly left-wing Cabinet. The *Journal des Débats* brings its gloomy reflections to an end by asserting that 'nothing is more afflicting than this spectacle and nothing makes the future look more dangerous.'

SHORTLY BEFORE EMBARKING for the United States, Sir Henri Deterding, guiding genius of the Royal Dutch Petroleum Company and of the Shell Transport and Trading Company, paid what was literally a flying visit to Paris, where he was closeted for three hours with Premier Tardieu. The local press announced that the two men were discussing the kidnapping of General Koutepov, leader of the White Russians, whose recent disappearance almost led to a break in Franco-Russian relations, but the correspondents of the *Frankfurter Zeitung* and the *Vossische Zeitung* asserted that oil was the real subject of their interview. All the petroleum now used by the French Navy comes from the Russian Naphtha Syndicate, but since the contract expires next year the idea seems to be that the Compagnie Française de Pétrole would like to draw upon the Mosul fields instead. France cannot, however, undertake this exploitation independently since she is only entitled to a certain proportion of the annual Mosul output, and the other interested parties do not wish to tap these fields yet on account of the present overproduction of oil elsewhere. What aspects of the situation Tardieu and Deterding touched upon were not revealed to the general public, but some new agreement between the French Government and the Deterding interests would seem to be on the cards.

THE FALL OF THE Müller Cabinet in Germany represents the failure of a widely inclusive coalition headed by a Socialist to hold

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

together on financial policy after it had arranged for the evacuation of the Rhineland, secured ratification of the Young Plan, and come to an agreement with Poland. The Brüning Cabinet that succeeds it in office does not contain members of so many different factions, but what it lacks in popularity it makes up for in solidarity. The *Berliner Tageblatt* comments approvingly on the collapse of the coalition, but the *Vossische Zeitung* announces darkly that the performance of the *Rheingold* has just ended and wonders whether the *Twilight of the Gods* is about to begin. *Le Temps* points out that this is not the first time Germany has been forced to resort to a government of men rather than of parties, but does not feel much good will come of the new government. The essential weakness of the present situation is that the opposition parties of Social Democrats, Communists, and National Socialists control 218 of the Reichstag's 490 seats and that if Hugenberg's forty or fifty hot-headed Nationalists join them they can overthrow the Centrist group that is now in control. Hugenberg, however, has shown surprising moderation, apparently recognizing that a government without Socialists is preferable to a government dominated by more radical groups. He should support Dr. Brüning's relatively conservative financial policies and if he opposes the new Cabinet in foreign affairs, he may be counterbalanced by the Socialists, who will probably continue to back up Foreign Minister Curtius. But this sudden tractability of Hugenberg's and the mysterious forebodings of the *Vossische Zeitung* may indicate the gathering of thunder on the left.

WHAT HAS AMOUNTED to a five-year economic war between Germany and Poland at last comes to an end with the signature of a commercial treaty between the two countries. Henceforth Poland will receive certain manufactured goods and will grant German ships most-favored-nation treatment, while Germany reluctantly agrees to purchase 200,000 pigs a year from Polish farmers. Poland is also to be allowed to export 320,000 tons of coal a month to Germany plus an amount equal to any coal it buys from German producers. The *Manchester Guardian's* Warsaw correspondent makes this comment:—

> Sooner or later the German Republic had to face the fact that with Poland there must either be war or peace. Hitherto it has been a mixture of both—a strained friendliness and a series of attempts to arrange tolerable business relations, accompanied by a desultory tariff war and a hankering after the lost provinces and—in the background—the expectation that some day Poland will be in trouble (with Russia, perhaps) and that then Germany will be able to extort territorial concessions in exchange for support, or even neutrality. This kind of thing could not go on, for the eastern regions of Germany suffered not only from the idiotic frontier line but also from the lack of the mutual accommodation that alone can make this frontier line tolerable. Eastern Germany simply

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

must have the Polish market, and cannot afford to wait while trade declines and unemployment grows just because Berlin cannot make up its mind to sign a real peace with Warsaw.

William Martin, foreign editor of the *Journal de Genève*, looking at the matter from a European point of view, writes as follows:—

> The new treaty is important to all of Europe from both a political and an economic standpoint. In the political domain it constitutes the alleviation of a very serious European condition. It means a return to normality—to use an expression particularly dear to the heart of Fascism—from a state of affairs that represented a permanent danger of international complications. And it lends weight, in the most favorable direction, to the recent statement of a German parliamentarian who said, 'Now that the western questions are settled, our relations with Poland become of paramount importance.'

THANKS TO THE SECOND HAGUE CONFERENCE, Bulgaria was extricated just in time from an exceedingly precarious position. Two foreign loans, one in 1926, the other in 1928, had encouraged the banks to issue too much credit and since 1927 imports have been increasing at the rate of $7,500,000 annually while exports have steadily dropped off. In 1929 the unfavorable trade balance amounted to nearly $20,000,000 and many business houses as well as one important bank had to shut down. Under these unfavorable circumstances only a clear definition of reparations obligations could save the country's morale and encourage productive work. Furthermore, the difficulties of last autumn made the weakness of Bulgaria's economic position clear to all the world: industry had been forced to expand too rapidly and agriculture had been neglected. Unfortunately the present Cabinet, although it has gone stale through long tenure of office, seems likely to remain in power. The agrarian opposition has developed no leader capable of challenging Premier Liapchev's authority, and Foreign Minister Burov and Finance Minister Mollov also seem to be irreplaceable. The Communists have taken advantage of this disorder and may even succeed in stampeding the peasants into a more violent form of opposition.

But Bulgaria's most serious problem centres about the Inner Macedonian Revolutionary Organization, whose activities extend into Yugoslav territory but whose headquarters are situated on Bulgarian soil. Various desperadoes connected with this society have been setting off bombs along the frontier in an effort to embroil Sofia and Belgrade. The Serbs, however, do not care to protest too violently, for whatever official recognition the I.M.R.O. may enjoy is due to the failure of Yugoslavia to apply the minority clauses of its various treaties with the Allied Powers to certain Bulgar-speaking Slavs in Serbian Macedonia. Indeed, the truth is that neither Government dares to deal severely with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Macedonians, whose hostility toward both powers may actually serve to keep them at peace.

AUSTRALIA IS AT PRESENT torn by two conflicting movements, one of them favoring centralization and the other demanding the creation of more states and the severe limitation of central authority. The former policy, backed not only by the industrialists but by the powerful Labor Party, seems to enjoy greater chances of success, but the unfortunate farmers, who are already being victimized by the preponderant power of the few big cities, have so much right on their side that they will hardly give up without a struggle. As matters now stand each state controls its own police, schools, courts, and—most important of all—railways. Federation is comparatively a new thing and many Australians continue to love their native state more than the Commonwealth, especially when the Commonwealth passes laws favorable to one state only and prejudicial to the interests of the others. Furthermore, the tendency of Australians to congregate in cities has created in rural communities a growing demand for more small states in preference to a single big one which the city dwellers would inevitably dominate.

In New South Wales, for instance, the northern area already pays two-fifths of the land tax and gets about one-sixteenth of the money expended on public works, and the farmers in this district have been complaining because they are compelled to send their products an extra three hundred miles to Sydney rather than to Melbourne, which has also the advantage of being seven hundred miles nearer to England. In Queensland, too, the capital city of Brisbane dominates. The state is fifteen hundred miles long and Brisbane, which is stuck at one end, prevents the inhabitants of central Queensland from shipping goods from their own port of Rockhampton. By the device of 'tapering rates' the heads of the government at Brisbane make it cheaper for farmers to ship from the capital rather than from some more convenient spot. Such high-handed behavior has made the country people dread what would happen if the big cities had their way and brought about complete unification with a remote central government working hand in glove with organized Labor. The fact is that Australia has long been cursed by the aggrandizement of a few top-heavy cities, but if that is what the majority of the people really prefer, it looks as if the rural minority would have to accept the consequences.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Here is the complete letter written by Gandhi to Viceroy Irwin of India—also the Viceroy's reply and Gandhi's final comment upon it. They are indeed the stuff of which living history is made.

BRITAIN in INDIA

By MAHATMA GANDHI

From *Young India*
Gandhi Swarajist Weekly

I. BRITISH RULE—A CURSE

GANDHI'S LETTER TO THE VICEROY

SATYAGRAHA ASHRAM, SABARMATI
March 2, 1930

DEAR FRIEND,—

Before embarking on civil disobedience and taking the risk I have dreaded to take all these years, I would fain approach you and find a way out. My personal faith is absolutely clear. I cannot intentionally hurt anything that lives, much less fellow human beings, even though they may do the greatest wrong to me and mine. While, therefore, I hold the British rule to be a curse, I do not intend harm to a single Englishman or to any legitimate interest he may have in India.

I must not be misunderstood. Though I hold the British rule in India to be a curse, I do not, therefore, consider Englishmen in general to be worse than any other people on earth. I have the privilege of claiming many Englishmen as dearest friends. Indeed, much that I have learned of the evil of British rule is due to the writings of frank and courageous Englishmen.

And why do I regard the British rule as a curse? It has impoverished the dumb millions by a system of progressive exploitation and by a ruinously expensive military and civil administration which the country can never afford. It has reduced us politically to serfdom. It has sapped

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the foundations of our culture. And, by its policy of cruel disarmament, it has degraded us spiritually.

In common with many of my countrymen, I had hugged the fond hope that the proposed round table conference might furnish a solution. But, when you said plainly that you could not give any assurance that you or the British Cabinet would pledge yourselves to support a scheme of full dominion status, the round table conference could not possibly furnish the solution for which vocal India is consciously, and the dumb millions are unconsciously, thirsting. Needless to say there never was any question of Parliament's verdict being anticipated. Instances are not wanting of the British Cabinet, in anticipation of the Parliamentary verdict, having pledged itself to a particular policy.

The Delhi interview having miscarried, there was no option for Pandit Motilal Nehru and me but to take steps to carry out the solemn resolution of the Congress arrived at in Calcutta at its session in 1928.

But the Resolution of Independence should cause no alarm, if the words, 'dominion status,' mentioned in your announcement had been used in their accepted sense. For has it not been admitted by responsible British statesmen that dominion status is virtual independence? What, however, I fear is that there never has been any intention of granting such dominion status to India in the immediate future.

But this is all past history. Since the announcement many events have happened which show unmistakably the trend of British policy.

It seems as clear as daylight that responsible British statesmen do not contemplate any alteration in British policy that might adversely affect Britain's commerce with India or require an impartial and close scrutiny of Britain's transactions with India. If nothing is done to end the process of exploitation India must be bled with an ever increasing speed. The Finance Member regards as a settled fact the 1/6 ratio which by a stroke of the pen drains India of a few crores. And when a serious attempt is being made through a civil form of direct action to unsettle this fact, among many others, even you cannot help appealing to the wealthy landed classes to help you to crush that attempt in the name of an order that grinds India to atoms.

Unless those who work in the name of the nation understand and keep in mind the motive that lies behind the craving for independence, there is every danger of independence itself coming to us so charged as to be of no value to those toiling, voiceless millions for whom it is sought and for whom it is worth taking. It is for that reason that I have been recently telling the public what independence should really mean.

LET me put before you some of the salient points. The terrific pressure of land revenue, which furnishes a large part of the total revenue, must

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

undergo considerable modification in an independent India. Even the much vaunted permanent settlement benefits the few rich zamindars, not the ryots. The ryot has remained as helpless as ever. He is a mere tenant at will. Not only, then, has the land revenue to be considerably reduced, but the whole revenue system has to be so revised as to make the ryot's good its primary concern. But the British system seems to be designed to crush the very life out of him. Even the salt he must use to live is so taxed as to make the burden fall most heavily on him, if only because of the heartless impartiality of its incidence. The tax shows itself to be still more burdensome on the poor man when it is remembered that salt is the one thing of which he must eat more than the rich man both individually and collectively. The drink and drug revenue, too, is derived from the poor. It saps the foundations of both their health and morals. It is defended under the false plea of individual freedom, but, in reality, is maintained for its own sake. The ingenuity of the authors of the reforms of 1919 transferred this revenue to the so-called responsible part of diarchy, so as to throw the burden of prohibition on it, thus, from the very beginning, rendering it powerless for good. If the unhappy minister wipes out this revenue he must starve education, since in the existing circumstances he has no new source of replacing that revenue. If the weight of taxation has crushed the poor from above, the destruction of the central supplementary industry, that is, hand spinning, has undermined their capacity for producing wealth. The tale of India's ruination is not complete without reference to the liabilities incurred in her name. Sufficient has been recently said about these in the public press. It must be the duty of a free India to subject all the liabilities to the strictest investigation, and repudiate those that may be adjudged by an impartial tribunal to be unjust and unfair.

The iniquities sampled above are maintained in order to carry on a foreign administration, demonstrably the most expensive in the world. Take your own salary. It is over Rs 21,000 per month, besides many other indirect additions. The British Prime Minister gets £5,000 per year, that is, over Rs 5,400 per month at the present rate of exchange. You are getting over Rs 700 per day against India's average income of less than annas 2 per day. The Prime Minister gets Rs 180 per day against Great Britain's average income of nearly Rs 2 per day. Thus you are getting much over five thousand times India's average income. The British Prime Minister is getting only ninety times Britain's average income. On bended knee I ask you to ponder over this phenomenon. I have taken a personal illustration to drive home a painful truth. I have too great a regard for you as a man to wish to hurt your feelings. I know that you do not need the salary you get. Probably the whole of your salary goes for charity. But a system that provides for such an arrangement deserves to be summarily scrapped.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A radical cutting down of the revenue, therefore, depends upon an equally radical reduction in the expenses of the administration. This means a transformation of the scheme of government. This transformation is impossible without independence. Hence, in my opinion, the spontaneous demonstration of the twenty-sixth of January, in which hundreds of thousands of villagers instinctively participated. To them independence means deliverance from the killing weight.

Not one of the great British political parties, it seems to me, is prepared to give up the Indian spoils to which Great Britain helps herself from day to day, often, in spite of the unanimous opposition of Indian opinion. Nevertheless, if India is to live as a nation, if the slow death by starvation of her people is to stop, some remedy must be found for immediate relief. The proposed conference is certainly not the remedy. It is not a matter of carrying conviction by argument. The matter resolves itself into one of matching forces. Conviction or no conviction, Great Britain would defend her Indian commerce and interests by all the forces at her command. India must consequently evolve force enough to free herself from that embrace of death.

IT IS common cause that, however disorganized, and, for the time being, insignificant, it may be, the party of violence is gaining ground and making itself felt. Its end is the same as mine. But I am convinced that it cannot bring the desired relief to the dumb millions. And the conviction is growing deeper and deeper in me that nothing but unadulterated nonviolence can check the organized violence of the British Government. Many think that nonviolence is not an active force. My experience, limited though it undoubtedly is, shows that nonviolence can be an intensely active force. It is my purpose to set that force in motion against the organized violent force of the British rule as well as against the unorganized violent force of the growing party of violence. To sit still would be to give rein to both the forces above mentioned. Having an unquestioning and immovable faith in the efficacy of nonviolence, as I know it, it would be sinful on my part to wait any longer.

This nonviolence will be expressed through civil disobedience, for the moment confined to the inmates of the Satyagraha Ashram, but ultimately designed to cover all those who choose to join the movement with its obvious limitations.

I know that in embarking on nonviolence I shall be running what might fairly be termed a mad risk. But the victories of truth have never been won without risks, often of the gravest character. Conversion of a nation that has consciously or unconsciously preyed upon another far more numerous, far more ancient, and no less cultured than itself is worth any amount of risk.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I have deliberately used the word conversion. For my ambition is no less than to convert the British people through nonviolence, and thus make them see the wrong they have done to India. I do not seek to harm your people. I want to serve them even as I want to serve my own people. I believe that I have always served them. I served them up to 1919 blindly. But when my eyes were opened and I conceived non-coöperation, the object still was to serve them. I employed the same weapon that I have in all humility successfully used against the dearest members of my family. If I have as much love for your people as for mine it will not long remain hidden. It will be acknowledged by them even as the members of my family acknowledged it after they had tried me for several years. If the people join me as I expect they will, the sufferings they will undergo, unless the British nation soon retraces its steps, will be enough to melt the stoniest hearts.

THE plan through civil disobedience will be to combat such evils as I have sampled out. If we want to sever the British connection it is because of such evils. When they are removed the path becomes easy. Then the way to friendly negotiation will be open. If the British commerce with India is purified of greed, you will have no difficulty in recognizing our independence. I respectfully invite you then to pave the way for immediate removal of those evils, and thus open a way for a real conference between equals, interested only in promoting the common good of mankind through voluntary fellowship and in arranging terms of mutual help and commerce equally suited to both. You have unnecessarily laid stress upon the communal problems that unhappily affect this land. Important though they undoubtedly are for the consideration of any scheme of government, they have little bearing on the greater problems which are above communities and which affect them all equally. But if you cannot see your way to deal with these evils and my letter makes no appeal to your heart, on the eleventh day of this month I shall proceed, with such coworkers of the Ashram as I can take, to disregard the provisions of the salt laws. I regard this tax to be the most iniquitous of all from the poor man's standpoint. As the independence movement is essentially for the poorest in the land the beginning will be made with this evil. The wonder is that we have submitted to the cruel monopoly for so long. It is, I know, open to you to frustrate my design by arresting me. I hope that there will be tens of thousands ready, in a disciplined manner, to take up the work after me, and, in the act of disobeying of the salt act to lay themselves open to the penalties of a law that should never have disfigured the statute book.

I have no desire to cause you unnecessary embarrassment, or any at all, so far as I can help. If you think that there is any substance in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

my letter, and if you will care to discuss matters with me, and if to that end you would like me to postpone publication of this letter, I shall gladly refrain on receipt of a telegram to that effect soon after this reaches you. You will, however, do me the favor not to deflect me from my course unless you can see your way to conform to the substance of this letter.

This letter is not in any way intended as a threat but is a simple and sacred duty incumbent on a civil resister. Therefore I am having it specially delivered by a young English friend who believes in the Indian cause and is a full believer in nonviolence and whom Providence seems to have sent to me, as it were, for the very purpose.

I remain,

Your sincere friend,

M. K. GANDHI

II. THE VICEROY REPLIES

DEAR MR. GANDHI,—

His Excellency the Viceroy desires me to acknowledge your letter of the second of March. He regrets to learn that you contemplate a course of action which is clearly bound to involve violation of the law and danger to the public peace.

Yours very truly,

G. CUNNINGHAM

Private Secretary

III. GANDHI'S LAST WORD

The reader is familiar with this reply. He will note, too, that it begs the question; and, if further justification were needed, this stereotyped reply affords it. On bended knee I asked for bread and I have received stone instead.

It was open to the Viceroy to disarm me by freeing the poor man's salt, the tax on which costs him five annas per year or nearly three days' income. I do not know outside India anyone who pays to the State Rs 3 per year, if he earns Rs 360 during that period. It was open to the Viceroy to do many other things except sending the usual reply. But the time is not yet. He represents a nation that does not easily give in, that does not easily repent. Entreaty never convinces it. It readily listens to physical force. It can witness with bated breath a boxing match for hours without fatigue. It can go mad over a football match in which there may be broken bones. It goes into ecstasies over bloodcurdling accounts of war. It will listen also to mute, resistless suffering. It will not part with the millions it annually drains from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

India in reply to any argument, however convincing. The viceregal reply does not surprise me.

But I know that the salt tax has to go and many other things with it, if my letter means what it says. Time alone can show how much of it was meant.

The reply says I contemplate a course of action which is clearly bound to involve violation of the law and danger to the public peace. In spite of the forest of books containing rules and regulations, the only law that the nation knows is the will of the British administrators, the only public peace the nation knows is the peace of a public prison. India is one vast prison house. I repudiate this law and regard it as my sacred duty to break the mournful monotony of the compulsory peace that is choking the heart of the nation for want of free vent.

German industry, set on its feet by American capital, faces a critical juncture. An authoritative French critic discusses the most astonishing economic miracle of modern times and outlines the prospects of the Reich.

GERMANY Comes Back

By GASTON RAPHAËL

Translated from the *Grand Revue*
Paris Literary and Political Monthly

OF THE MANY SURPRISING developments that have occurred since the War, the revival and development of German industry is certainly one of the most important. It is a problem that unceasingly attracts our attention. At one moment bitter quarrels on the subject of reparations force our statesmen and technical experts to study Germany's economic activity and her capacity to pay. The next moment we hear conflicting reports of immense industrial mergers, of vast impend-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing failures, or of equally remarkable progress. We keep turning our eyes willy nilly toward a country that is at once vanquished and strangely active.

Seldom are we able to throw a clear searchlight on the extraordinary conditions that prevail in modern Germany. Even the most expert observers pass contradictory judgments, some optimistic, others frankly pessimistic. As for reports made by the Germans themselves, they almost invariably contradict similar reports by foreigners, including the one made by the agent general for reparations payments. A new agreement has just been reached at the Hague, but uncertainty still persists. It therefore seems an appropriate moment to attempt to prophesy what will happen to the Young Plan and to gather together information concerning the economic progress Germany has already made.

One thing is certain, Germany has gone through a period almost without precedent in modern history. So many unusual events have occurred, so many upsets have followed each other with bewildering speed, that all our usual ideas of economics seem to be destroyed. What is true one day no longer holds true the next, and for ten years Germany has been turned into a great experimental laboratory. No one would go so far as to say that all these experiments were wise or happy, nor should other nations be urged to imitate them, but the undeniable fact is that Germany, far from being stricken down by a terrible catastrophe, has promptly raised herself up and almost equaled or even surpassed her pre-War activity and perhaps even her pre-War prosperity.

DEFEAT, revolution, and the peace treaty threw Germany into a state of indescribable chaos. In the first place, the country suffered considerable material losses in the form of 72,800 square kilometres out of a total area of 540,857 square kilometres and 7,130,000 of her 65,000,000 inhabitants. These territories and the people that occupied them were the richest and most industrious of Germany. The country also saw herself dispossessed in proportions varying from 17 to 72 per cent of her sources of raw materials and of a great number of her factories. Though she retained nearly all her coal mines, she had to deliver 45,000,000 tons a year to France, Belgium, and Italy, a figure that was soon reduced, however, to 20,000,000 tons. She had to give up a good part of her means of transportation and almost all her merchant marine. As for her financial losses arising from War expenses and War indemnities, they must be estimated in the billions.

She also suffered other losses more difficult to express in figures but equally tragic and serious. No less than 1,825,000 men were killed in battle and millions more were wounded, so that her labor supply was greatly reduced. The economic solidarity that had been systematically

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

built up between Westphalia, Luxemburg, and Lorraine was shattered. Her potash and chemical monopolies were destroyed. Her world-wide network of business houses and propaganda and advertising centres, as well as her advantageous commercial treaties, were swept away by the tempest. During the War nations that had previously bought German goods were forced to organize new industries of their own which they desired to preserve and to defend against the severe international competition that soon developed.

The moral collapse of the country was no less serious. As a result of the blockade Germany lived in an unhealthy atmosphere which caused employers and workers alike to lose all taste for normal work, simple living, and honest business. The Empire had proved a miserable failure, Socialists had come into power, and, though they joined the middle class in fighting Bolshevism for a short, anxious period, they persisted in applying their economic theories, and in March, 1919, pushed through a hasty series of socialistic laws. Months of undernourishment, crowded living conditions, and lack of coal were sapping the economic life of the country.

The present looked sombre and the future most lamentable. None the less, an active eye could detect a few rays of light in the darkness. The peace treaty is not really the murderous instrument that its victims pretend it to be. The losses, however grievous they may have been, are not proving irremediable. Money did not fall as rapidly as people thought it would and foreigners showed their confidence in Germany by speculating on the revival of the mark, thus furnishing the country with indirect but effective aid. The momentary halt in business made the lack of labor less noticeable. The workers' attitude is proving that if they are better nourished and lodged they will return to their former way of life, nor have the industrial leaders despaired. Not all of them, to be sure, are energetic and farsighted, but the country was fortunate in the possession of a few eminent leaders, the most famous of whom were Walther Rathenau and Hugo Stinnes.

Different as these two men were in character and divergent as the interests of their industries may have been, both shared the same profound convictions. They had the same ardent faith in what they called 'German economy.' In spite of their patriotic chagrin they took joy in observing that the economic organization of the country had survived the old régime. They were more convinced than ever that this was the essential element in the country's life, 'the master root of the German economic tree,' which must be nourished if the powerful branches of that tree were to be filled with life. They believed themselves to be the only men capable of assuming such a task, and Hugo Stinnes announced that all the leaders of the country's economic life would presently recover their influence and power and that they would be called upon by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the people, who were half dead from hunger and needed bread rather than fine phrases.

HAVING reassured themselves in this way, they at once resolved to act. From the beginning they were undoubtedly convinced that an immediate return to reason and a sharp halt to revolutionary methods would alone prevent catastrophe, but how were they to determine the possibilities of to-morrow, or the day after? Difficulties at home and complications abroad arose simultaneously and could not be treated separately. At first they had to trust to luck and then, by proceeding more and more vigorously, they advanced their work of regeneration.

The first period, which was chiefly a defensive one, began with a regrouping of employers' associations, that had been more numerous in Germany than anywhere else. On the fourth of April, 1919, the *Reichsverband der deutschen Industrie* was founded in Berlin and became a kind of general staff charged with the defense of the country's economic interests. Another association, known as the *Vereinigung deutscher Arbeitgeberverbände*, ranged itself at its side and undertook the task of supervising social questions. Businesses and banks formed special groups, while the two big agricultural leagues joined forces as a single body of two million members known as the *Reichslandbund.*

From this moment on resistance stiffened and the attack began. The first objective was the Versailles Treaty, which the whole nation naturally detested. Next the Socialists were attacked and particularly the new laws that they had passed. The socialization law is now almost a dead letter. The economic council remains and will continue to be provisional and the workers' councils are being held in check or reduced to playing secondary rôles. Erzberger lost his life trying to restore the public finances by seizing revenue and capital, but his attempts came to naught. The army was demobilized, not without some friction, to be sure, but with surprising ease. The material and financial difficulties were not surmounted as quickly as the industrialists desired but not so slowly as to produce formidable disorder. The decision was made to continue the ambitious pre-War policies of production and expansion.

When these first steps had been made the following difficulties still remained. How was Germany to organize her industry in such a way as to secure herself both raw materials and markets? How was she to meet the necessities of the Versailles Treaty? How was she to cope with the consequences of the revolution? It was a difficult task and from 1920 to 1923 it was pushed through with increasing determination and energy.

The dominating idea was to save the existence of the nation by saving industry. This policy led first of all to the formation of those enormous consortiums of which Hugo Stinnes's was the first and most

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

celebrated. The great magnate of the Ruhr explained himself quite clearly. Industry had to be concentrated to a greater degree than it had been in any other country in the world. Little enterprises had to be sacrificed to larger ones, which were the only organizations capable of purchasing raw materials advantageously, operating factories at the lowest possible cost, and receiving the most profitable prices for finished products. His appeal was followed by two years of industrial and commercial mergers.

The second idea was to meet the obligations of the peace treaty only in so far as they had to do with reparations. An attempt to refuse payment brought forth the London ultimatum of May, 1921, whereupon Walther Rathenau and Joseph Wirth inaugurated a policy of so-called execution which soon led to a demand for a moratorium and to the conferences of Cannes and Genoa in 1922. Furthermore, every effort was brought to bear to escape from the economic demands made by the same treaty. The fairs held at Leipzig and other cities were resumed and former clients were invited to attend. Merchandise began to flow to other countries, often through devious channels. The merchant marine started to revive and even in the Far East Germany began competing for world trade.

These two ideas combined to bring about the inflation. It would be a mistake to assert that the fall of the mark represented the express wishes of the German business men or their government. The financial mistakes made during the War had rendered it inevitable. No preventive measures had been taken, and the Germans, like all other nations, found themselves being swept away by the inflation more rapidly than they had expected. Having first seen in it nothing more than a necessary evil, the industrialists presently discovered that it offered them a means of procuring financial resources that would help them to restore their factories, reconquer world markets, and expose the malign intentions of the authors of the peace treaty. For that reason they supported the inflation to the end.

AS FOR the consequences of the revolution, if the imperfect Socialist laws were not entirely abrogated, passive or even active resistance rendered them largely ineffective and even the Socialists in the trade unions were impelled by their patriotism and their desire to maintain life to share the views of their employers.

A prosperity more apparent than real returned and prevented Germany from returning to calm habits of work and resuming contacts with the outer world. But unfortunately the process continued too long. The ruses practised in connection with reparations were pushed too far. The inevitable crisis began when the French and Belgian troops entered

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Ruhr. Conditions grew more and more serious and Germany fell into a worse state than she did after the War. Thanks, however, to new and even more violent and costly efforts, she revived a second time.

The first problem was to acquire a new and sound currency and then to protect it from the perils of inflation. This difficult work was accomplished by Hjalmar Schacht and Hans Luther. The second problem was to procure resources to support the *Rentenmark*, then to establish a sound gold currency and, above all, to fill up again the natural reservoirs, the reserves of industry and the banks, which had been quite exhausted by the War and the inflation. The Dawes Plan, advocated by industry and business alike, was adopted and procured an official loan of 800,000,000 marks. America opened its coffers to various states, municipalities, and industrial enterprises. Not counting short-term loans, the United States advanced to Germany more than six billion marks in the course of four or five years. On the other hand, the many organizations that had been formed after the War were abandoned. As soon as circumstances changed, the German industrialists no longer persisted in clinging to out-of-date combinations but hastened to enter new ones. During the fall of 1925 and on through the first six months of 1926 most of the huge consortiums that had been built on and for the inflation collapsed, along with innumerable minor organizations that had sprouted like mushrooms during the troubled years. Then when the ground was clear and the atmosphere had grown fresh again there was brought back to life the cartel of yesterday, that is to say, a type of organization in which industrialists combined to regulate production and eliminate competition, keeping at the same time their own autonomy. New groupings and fusions likewise occurred among firms engaged in the same industry. Some of these groups attained enormous proportions unparalleled heretofore in Germany and surpassed only in America.

The expenses that were irking German economy had to be eliminated or decreased. The chief task was to restore and reorganize industrial production. Although the War had spared the German factories, ten years had passed and no fresh equipment had been installed. Repairs were needed and new technical machinery was required. With a shout of 'Let us imitate and surpass America!' Germany proceeded to this work of repair by means of rationalization, which enabled her to increase her production capacity a third. She then turned to the task of reconquering her foreign markets and building up her export trade, on which depended her ability to pay reparations and to purchase the raw materials and food stuffs which she is consuming in considerable, perhaps excessive, quantities. In order to attain this end as rapidly as possible, Germany gladly entered into private international agreements whereby leaders of similar industries united to regulate production and sales within certain limits. If these agreements have not always yielded

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all the profits expected of them they have at least helped Germany to attain the real ends she desired. In actuality, therefore, the country's situation has at least become comparable to the situations of other lands. The wild fluctuation that occurred immediately after the War has ceased. Production is stabilized and German goods are making their way in all the markets of the world. In nearly every domain the statistics for production and selling have equaled or surpassed the 1913 figures. This being the case, two questions arise. What are we to think of Germany's industrial revival, and what future can it expect?

IT WOULD be ungracious to deny the amazing speed and conscious energy that have been displayed. Rarely in history has a nation recovered in such a way from an economic situation that seemed so hopelessly compromised. No miracle has occurred and there is no occasion to incriminate Germany with duplicity and felony or to assert that the allied countries have been blind or complaisant. The fact is that a populous, industrious, ingenious nation has known how to recover itself and has been able after severe suffering to raise itself from the abyss into which it had fallen. Its efforts have been assisted by dissensions and shortcomings among its adversaries and competitors but truth obliges us to admit that the revival of Germany is explained more readily by the native qualities of the country and by the fact that under present conditions of international solidarity the world profits more from the prosperity than from the collapse of any single state.

Under these circumstances we seem entitled to believe that the work accomplished so far does not lack solidarity. The great financial reform has been executed in such a way that the German mark runs no risk of undergoing a fresh collapse and the same thing is true of the country's reorganized industry. But does the picture contain no shadows at all? The complaints of the Germans themselves prove the opposite. Even if they lament their fate too strenuously we must recognize the numerous and grave difficulties that they face.

The difficulties to which they chiefly call our attention are of a financial order. Common sense proves that all the skill in the world cannot correct errors committed in this field. A nation cannot spend unheard-of sums of money fighting a war for four years and then inflate its currency without exhausting nearly all its reserves. Remarkable as German's vitality may be, lack of money makes itself felt in every department of the country's economic life. Foreign loans have imparted some new blood but they are far from sufficient and heavy interest must be paid on them. The danger of an invasion of foreign capital already constitutes a menace. Rather than contract heavy obligations, certain enterprises, among them the *Allgemeine Elektrizitätsgesellschaft*, are putting

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

some of their shares in the hands of American capitalists. It will undoubtedly be a matter of decades before the losses suffered up to now can be repaired.

Moreover, neither commercial treaties nor international agreements can bring German exports up to the level they should attain. On the one hand, Germany feels the pressing need to sell extensively abroad because her population is rapidly increasing and dwells on a limited extent of territory whose unfavored soil does not provide it with sufficient nourishment, while at the same time her production capacities have increased much more rapidly than her powers of consumption. On the other hand, there is an excess labor supply compared with what existed before the War and a strong and cultivated working class is enjoying high salaries and many social benefits. Vast countries that used to buy from Germany, especially Russia, the Balkans, and Turkey, were forced to cultivate home industries during the War, and are now surrounded by tariff walls. From this fundamental contradiction it follows that the productive plant cannot work full time, that prices cannot go much lower, that exports can increase only slowly, and that the country must suffer from chronic unemployment.

This is the way, then, that the situation seems to lie between Germany and her competitors: Germany has again become a redoubtable rival as a result of her rapid reconstruction and abundant energy, but other nations likewise want to live and they will only make partial concessions and will continue to defend their own interests. Germany thus stands in an uncertain position, at once brilliant and difficult. After an astounding revival she finds herself blocked in the path that she wishes to pursue. The danger of another collapse has not yet definitely passed away but this danger is not so great in the financial field as in the economic. Since she can scarcely return to the methods, legal or illegal, that she pursued in the troubled years after the War, it is on universal coöperation and a wise regulation of world economy that the fate of Germany, as well as of all other nations, depends.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Opposition to the Labor Government is not confined to members of the opposition parties. W. J. Brown, a Labor member of Parliament, assails the domestic policies of Mr. MacDonald and hints openly of bloody revolution.

LABOR in Office

By W. J. Brown, M.P.

From the *New Leader*
London Left-Wing Labor Weekly

THE LABOR GOVERNMENT has now been in office for ten months. That is too short a period to pass a final judgment upon its work, but it is not too short to suggest some reflections of a very disquieting kind.

Whatever else the country wanted when it turned out the Baldwin administration, it certainly wanted change. The election results were not so much a vote for Labor as a vote against 'Safety First.' That cry was good enough as a reaction from the instabilities of the Lloyd George régime, but in a situation in which an economic black plague was creeping over the face of the country, a situation in which the condition of agriculture became more desperate every year, a situation in which a million men were condemned to the bitter hospitality of the streets, it completely lost its appeal.

How far has the hope of change been justified? In the field of foreign affairs—abundantly. The withdrawal of the British troops from the Rhine, the signature of the Optional Clause, the 'parity' agreement with the U. S. A., the offer to Egypt, the recognition of Russia—all these stand to the credit of the Government in its short term of office.

But what of the situation at home? In the House night after night Labor members vote with a discipline and a solidarity which is the envy of every other political party. But behind the discipline and outward solidarity lies a tremendous uneasiness. Soon it will break out into open dissension. In the issue about which the storm will break are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

embodied a dozen others. In it are involved the issue of the young men versus the old men, the issue of constructive statesmanship versus laissez faire, the issue of Cobdenite fetishes versus practical facts, and the issue of the nineteenth-century mind versus the twentieth-century mind. In it are involved the personal futures of Mr. J. H. Thomas, Sir Oswald Mosley, and it may be the fate of the Government itself. It is the issue of unemployment.

At the outset let it be said that the rise in the unemployment figure is not the fault of the Government. Let it be said that no Government in ten months can cope with a situation which is the product of decades. But, when all has been said, there emerges at the end this question: is there in Government deeds or words any sign of a policy which in any reasonable measure of time will wipe out, or reduce to normal proportions, that dread figure of a million and a half unemployed? The answer is—'As yet, no.'

THE Government's 'policy' is divided into two parts. First, a 'short-term' policy of stimulating public works to provide temporary relief while the 'long-term' policy is being carried through. The 'long-term' policy is the rationalization of industry—especially the exporting industries—with a view to gaining a larger share of the world's markets.

The first part of the policy can be dismissed in a sentence. It would take, on Mr. Thomas's figures, £100,000,000 per annum to provide work for 400,000 men, and we should still be left with over a million unemployed. There is not the slightest prospect of that £100,000,000 being forthcoming, either by way of development loan or by way of Exchequer grant. The 'Iron Chancellor' stands in the way.

What about the 'long-term' policy? Is it true that by rationalizing industry we can gain so big an increase in our share of the world's markets as to absorb our million and a half unemployed? None whatever, and we may as well face this fact soon as late.

Industrialism developed in England earlier than in any other country. In the hundred years of our industrial revolution we reorganized our economy on the basis that we were to be the workshop of the world. The towns grew, the countryside shrank. We became gradually dependent for most of our food supplies on other countries, exporting manufactured goods in exchange. Had the process stopped there things might have remained tolerable. But they did not. Capitalist industrialism spread to other countries. We became, instead of the workshop of the world, one workshop out of many.

Even before the War it had become difficult to maintain our lop-sided economy in the new conditions. The War intensified the difficulty enormously. To-day countries which in the past provided great markets

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for British goods not only supply their own markets, but have become our competitors in the markets of the rest of the world. Moreover, because their industrial systems developed later, they built on our acquired experience, with more up-to-date plants, with better machinery, with larger units of production.

Here are some examples. In 1913 we held the greatest share of the Chinese import trade, supplying 15 per cent of her total imports compared with 7 per cent supplied by the United States. By 1928, the proportions had become reversed. In 1913 our share of the total imports of Argentine was 31 per cent; in 1926 it was 19 per cent. During the same period the United States improved her share from 14 per cent to 24 per cent. In India our share of the total imports has dropped from 64 per cent in 1913 to 45 per cent in 1928–1929. What we have lost Japan and America have gained.

IF WE take the figure of 100 as the production of Europe in 1913, we find that by 1927 production had risen to 109. In the same period the population rose to 106; or, in other words, production over Europe as a whole hardly more than kept pace with the increase in population. In Great Britain we have only just reached the 1913 level of production with a heavy increase in population as compared with 1913. In America the production figures rose from 100 to 166 during the same period. These figures mean that the centre of gravity of capitalism is shifting from the Old World, and especially Great Britain, to the New World.

Now take the idea of rationalization. It is not denied that the first effects of rationalization are to increase unemployment. In 1921, for example, we turned out a million and a half tons of shipbuilding and employed 230,000 men to do it. In 1929 we turned out the same tonnage, but we did it with 70,000 less men. The explanation? The development of labor by rationalization.

But, granted that rationalization at first intensifies the problem, will it ultimately help? Let us see.

The 1924 census of production showed that the net output (that is, output minus raw materials) per head of the industrial population was £210. On that basis, to absorb our million and a half unemployed we should require an expansion of over £300,000,000 in our export trade. Is there anyone, in any party, who will suggest that an increase on this scale is humanly possible in present world conditions?

But now note this appalling fact. Even if it were, even if the impossible were possible, it would hardly compensate for the increase in the employable population which this country will experience in the next five years!

What do these figures mean? They mean that, on the basis of our

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

present policy, the unemployment figure, so far from going down, will go higher and higher. They mean that politicians of all parties have no conception of the problem that has to be faced. They mean that the black plague will become a black death. They mean that we are in sight of the breakdown of our social order.

What is the remedy? Tariffs? Clearly not. America, Germany, Italy, and Japan are the most highly protected countries in the world. America has 6,000,000 unemployed, Germany 3,000,000, Italy over 500,000. If the most advanced as well as the most backward industrial systems, if the most highly protected and the least protected countries are alike subject to the same disease, it is sun-clear that the remedy has to be looked for elsewhere than in fiscal questions or in questions of rationalization.

Is it to produce more? We cannot sell what we now produce. Then what is the cure?

The clue is given by the following extract, which appeared in a great daily newspaper recently:—

> The world is full of people hesitating to produce for want of customers, and full of persons whose needs are not 'effective,' who do not become consumers. . . .
>
> Once we are clear on this point we may emerge from the tunnel into which we have wandered with our eyes fixed solely on production.

Consumption—there is the key. The need of our people for goods is obvious.

Ninety per cent of the population have less than they really require. Our capacity to produce the goods is beyond question. What is it that comes between the need of our people and the expression of that need in terms of ability to consume? It is the capitalist wage system, under which the masses cannot buy back with the wages they get the very things that they themselves produce. Because they cannot, we have reached in all the great industrial countries of the earth a situation in which an ever increasing capacity to produce faces an ever increasing inability to consume.

And what relation is there between the deeds of any of the great political parties and this problem? The answer is—'None.' The whole future of democratic politics in England hangs in the balance. When a social system cannot feed the ever increasing masses of the people, there are only four ways out of the difficulty. One is wholesale emigration; the second is wholesale birth restriction; the third is war; and the fourth is to get a new system. And, unless our politics face up to the need for getting a new system, an historian of a future generation may write with truth that the fourth decade of the twentieth century represented the Kerenski period of British politics.

And after Kerenski—if Kerenski fail—comes Lenin!

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Germany has always felt the need of strong men for leaders and she is fortunate in having two such powerful figures as Hindenburg and Luther in such important positions. Here are two very friendly portraits, one of each.

Hindenburg *and* Luther

By Two German Correspondents

I. President von Hindenburg

By Georg Bernhard

Translated from the *Vossische Zeitung*, Berlin Liberal Daily

WE OPPOSED him when the Nationalists put him up for the presidency of the German Republic. That was our right. After the election we greeted him as the duly elected president of the entire German people. That was our duty. To-day we thank him for the words which he addressed to the German people after he had affixed his signature to the Young Plan. This expression of our gratitude is a heartfelt necessity, though it would seem a matter of course for the President of the German Republic to proclaim laws that both the Reichstag and the Reichsrat have adopted. Just as there was no other course open to him but to swear allegiance to the Constitution after he had declared himself ready to abide by the popular choice if it should fall upon him, so the fact of his holding the presidential office meant that he must proclaim the Young Plan as it passed into the form of law.

Yet he could have announced it without comment. His decision to explain, through a declaration to the people, his action in signing the decree, together with the manner of his declaration, will win him esteem throughout the country. For by that gesture he convinced millions

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Germans who may still have been in doubt that he was not acting solely under constitutional compulsion. Through the medium of his proclamation the President expressed his conviction, arrived at after serious inner struggle and careful examination of the arguments presented to him by his ministers and by the leaders of all parties, that the Young Plan represents an advance in spite of all its defects and in spite of the heavy obligations it involves. No doubt this has a very unpleasant sound to those who violently stirred up public passion during the agitation over the referendum and the plebiscite and who wished to brand approval of the Young Plan as a crime, but they were not quite so bold as to include the honorable Field Marshal von Hindenburg in the category of Young Plan criminals whom they especially stigmatized and threatened in one paragraph of their referendum. Indeed, the agitators endeavored to explain this paragraph away in so far as von Hindenburg was concerned, asserting that the paragraph in question referred only to the responsible ministers of state, not to the president of the Republic, who is constrained to announce publicly laws which have already been determined upon under the responsibility of his ministers. But through the medium of his recent proclamation von Hindenburg aligned himself with his ministers. The sentiment of comradeship characteristic of the old soldier did not permit him to tolerate the thought of separation from his political counselors. He became persuaded that their opinion was his own. He acknowledged his conviction with courage and candor. His gesture warms the heart and makes it seem essential to render him thanks, especially since civilian courage in Germany is a rare virtue impossible to overestimate.

WHEN the movement which finally culminated in the popular referendum got under way, the cry of 'More power for the President' was frequently reiterated. In opposing this proposal we have always maintained that the German form of government gives the president of the Republic an extraordinary amount of political authority which cannot be extended by adopting a few more paragraphs, and the procedure of the President during the past few weeks has proven how great his constitutional freedom of action really is. But the echo which Hindenburg's proclamation has awakened throughout the Republic has thrown into relief a more important factor, to wit, that the moral power of the President must be rated higher than his political authority. As a matter of fact this was the intention of the Constitution of the Republic. We can still remember what a vigorous struggle was waged to determine whether the president of the Republic should be elected by the national legislature or by the people at large. In the ranks of the National Assembly of Weimar a strong sentiment favored a president

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

elected by the legislature. This feeling was not to be wondered at, for at that time there was a firmer belief than exists at present that the basic principle on which the young Republic was founded, namely that all authority is derived from the people, could only be brought to a genuine fruition by having the people elect a single-chamber legislature which should embody popular sovereignty. And just as public opinion opposed a bicameral legislature, so was it also unwilling to limit the scope of the popular chamber by a president elected by the people. None the less the idea of a popularly elected German president finally prevailed and to-day popular sovereignty finds expression in the president of the Republic and in the Reichstag, two political forms which, though mutually independent, are in close contact with each other.

The rights and powers of both elements are regulated by the Constitution, and the spheres of authority proper to each are clearly defined. Furthermore, each has its own specific moral weight beyond its purely political influence. The Reichstag's lofty political authority should no more be doubted or disparaged than the moral effects produced by its significant legislative decisions. But the Reichstag has importance by virtue of being a corporate body. The corporate character of the German parliament is especially accentuated by the use of the inflexible list system in voting, which results in the voter subordinating his judgment about the personalities of candidates to their party affiliations.

The president of the Republic, on the other hand, is elected wholly as an individual. In the case of presidential elections no one can know to how great an extent party affiliation is neglected by the voter for preoccupation with the personality of the candidate. A president thus chosen directly by the people is the focal point of the confidence not only of the millions of Germans who elected him but of many millions of those who opposed him but who expect that after the election he will regard himself as the father of the entire people, as their representative, their adviser, and their monitor. A president elected by parliament would, like the president of a legislature, take pains to hold himself above party, but it would be very easy for him to subordinate the people to party considerations. Furthermore, if he has previously served in the legislature, the possibility exists that when he is faced with difficult decisions his old habit of thinking in terms of party factions will tend to form his judgment. On the other hand, the popularly elected president, chosen as a man by men, lifted on a shield above the heads of the people by the people themselves, is more strongly fortified against the illusions of parliamentary arithmetic. He is presumably the embodiment of sane human intelligence, which he applies whenever the parliamentary mathematicians are at a complete loss. Yet essentially he

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

represents the salvation of the parliamentary system, in that he helps to extricate it from apparently hopeless situations. He is the wise master appointed by the people themselves and directly responsible to them.

NOTHING shows more plainly than von Hindenburg's recent actions that Germany will not need a dictatorship so long as the president of the Republic performs in difficult situations the full duty exacted by his appointment. Recent occurrences also prove that the Constitution is sufficiently flexible to permit an adequate range of activity to the individuality of a president who is conscious of the obligations he has assumed. It is possible to trace the far-reaching effect of von Hindenburg's action in the gratifying statement issued by the spokesman of the Popular Conservative Union on the very day of the presidential proclamation. He and his friends, in whose names a declaration of loyalty to von Hindenburg was also made public, understood correctly the exhortation contained in the President's words, an exhortation to the effect that after the settlement of the Young Plan unity should be restored among the German people. This restoration of harmony is not calculated to end party differences. In the future as in the past individuals and parties will group themselves according to various social philosophies, and the battles that rage over these philosophies will inevitably be prolonged.

But the methods of conducting these battles have gradually assumed extraordinary forms. The slogan of the day seems to be: 'Willst du nicht mein Bruder sein, schlag' ich dir den Schädel ein.' ('If you won't be my brother true, I'll smash your cranium for you.') The speeches of certain Nationalist deputies on the subject of the law for the defense of the Republic and the Young Plan aroused feelings of aversion throughout all the parties from left to right but such men merely enjoy terrorizing the world by futile bluster and have at the moment no thought of action.

On the other hand, some of them may cherish honest convictions and might actually proceed from words to deeds if they had the opportunity. In this case they would furnish the best possible evidence for the necessity of the National Defense Law. This law will not prevent anyone from stating his opinion and from giving voice in suitable fashion to his particular point of view. It will, however, protect the free expression and practice of convictions from the menace of vile accusation and brutal bodily injury. The law forbids the use of vulgar and violent means of proselytizing. It attempts, in short, to reëstablish securely the exercise of freedom of conscience and the possibility of expressing all varieties of opinion. Thus the Defense Law displays the same temper as the presidential exhortation.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

II. Reichsbank President Luther

By René Kraus

Translated from *Pester Lloyd*, Budapest German-Language Daily

HE HAS THE STRONGEST political temperament in Germany, but the word 'political' is not to be taken so much in a narrow sense as in its original meaning of 'having to do with public life.' For Dr. Luther has never been strong for parties or parliaments. It is not that he underestimates the significance of these institutions; he is too practical a person to bring ethical values to bear on an already determined state of affairs. All he tries to do is to accept things as they are and make the best of them. If all his parliamentary activities have not been successful that is not his fault. Always a bit of an outsider from the party that he himself founded, he has never been a man to march in step with the rank and file as career politicians are forced to do and that is why he lost his seat in the Reichstag at the last minute, when it seemed certain that he would be able to retain it. He would have proved an intractable party worker and the German parliamentary system has become a little too easy-going.

In the years following the fall of Luther's cabinet, the leading German politicians showed remarkable skill in keeping him out of parliament. The most inconsequential of deputies had more authority than he to speak and to act in the name of the nation. But Luther's temperament was such that he could seldom deny himself speech and never action, and it must be admitted that the organization he founded known as the *Bund zur Erneuerung des Reiches* (Association for the Renovation of the Reich) offered the Reichstag stiff competition in the way it approached the one outstanding national problem—that of internal reform. And more than that—when Dr. Hellpach resigned from the Reichstag not long ago he reproached the five hundred representatives of the nation for having entirely ceded their initiative on a vital question 'in favor of a former chancellor,' and he gave this cession of initiative as the reason for his retirement.

A curious mixture of dislike and affection characterized the relations between parliament and Luther when he was chancellor. His authority was uncontested. 'He is not an iron chancellor. On the contrary, he is a rubber chancellor and that is the source of his strength,' a prominent deputy informed me in a malicious tone of voice that expressed the tension between the government and the representatives of the people.

Luther held office during Germany's most critical period. No one wanted to assume responsibility for the continued succession of domestic upheavals that kept occurring. For that reason Luther was allowed to carry on as best he could. It was not that he had performed yeoman's service in building up the foreign, domestic, and financial policies of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the new government. It was simply that everyone feared that some inner explosion would blow Germany to bits at any moment. Hence this somewhat suspect outsider fitted the situation perfectly. The adaptability behind which he often masked his definite policies satisfied their craving for a restful atmosphere. The rubber chancellor had an open ear and polite smile for every faction and every party, but after his visitors had left him he would continue to pursue his own personal programme, paying no attention whatever to the representations that the leaders of parties and factions had made. For that reason they finally encompassed his downfall, taking the Flag Law as their excuse and asserting that he belonged to no group and that no one knew where his allegiance lay.

THERE was also a time, and it was the most heroic period in Luther's career, when the capitalists despised him—and not without reason, for his taxation policies were almost confiscatory. Bank directors, accustomed as they were to storm and stress, could only laugh nervously when the name of the former minister of finance passed their lips. However, this happened but seldom, for they generally referred to Dr. Luther merely as 'he.'

A few weeks ago he said this to me: 'Two words must be hammered into every German's head: "Save money." Germany's existence depends on the accumulation of domestic capital.' Is this a changed point of view? Not at all. It merely follows from what he believed before. He reconstituted German capital when he filled the treasury coffers with the earnings of German industry. It was a desperate remedy, suicidal if it failed, but decisive if it succeeded. Like everything else to which Dr. Luther has set his hand, this policy succeeded. He is not at home in the empty realm of theories and theorems. The rights or wrongs of any question are unimportant to him. Only its successful functioning matters. Though Luther is much less given to dogmatism than the average German, he preaches his gospel of keeping money within the country with all the conviction of a dogmatist. He recognizes the unsupportability of present circumstances, with interest rates low but money hard to find. His attitude toward foreign loans is not dissimilar to the attitude that Schacht held and he does not believe they offer the country salvation. In this field he will not be an easy-going president of the Reichsbank, but God preserve Germany from any more easy-going leaders! Luther is an advocate of economy and rationalization. For a long time now irrational management has been bringing German agriculture to the border of catastrophe and all this while he has been pleading in speech and writing for standardized production. In respect to public activities Luther's work has only begun.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As a European figure, Luther's name is identified with Locarno, and that health resort in southern Switzerland has come to possess an almost legendary character in the minds of many Germans. Of course, all our dreams do not come true, but nevertheless troops are marching out of the occupied Rhineland. Although Stresemann is generally hailed as the man responsible for the evacuation, it is well to remember that without Dr. Luther the Locarno pact could never have been signed and Europe would have suffered a setback whose consequences no one can imagine. The weeks spent there witnessed a bitter struggle and not any rosy dream. Some years afterward Briand described some of the incidents that occurred during these negotiations, dwelling particularly on the moment when he and Stresemann were most doubtful of being able to achieve a pact of friendship. It was the decisive session and the delegations had spent a day and a half in private consultation without seeing each other. It was at this famous juncture that 'monsieur le chancelier' Luther launched into a long speech in such perfect French that Briand still remembers it with astonishment. Luther spoke of Germany's critical condition. Not a word of pathos did he utter; he merely brought together facts that were doubly impressive because of the straightforward manner in which he related them. Nor did he lay down any ultimatum; he merely expressed his conviction. Some way must be found of reconciling the thousand and one difficulties that confronted them because neither Germany nor France could allow the conference to collapse. 'His optimism carried us all away,' Briand recalled.

Optimism has always remained the foundation stone of Dr. Luther's character in spite of changing times and problems. It is the optimism of the practical man. It is no accident that he should keep encouraging the youth of Germany with the words, 'With Germany's own strength.' There is nothing of the romantic about him, only figures and statistics, trade balances and problems of rationalization. He is not a truly popular man, but because he attaches no great importance to popularity he finds followers. The new president of the Reichsbank will influence German financial policies purposefully, to use one of his favorite words. Through the Young Plan he will bring about close coöperation between the various banks of issue that so worthily represent German economy.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LETTERS AND THE ARTS

Morals and Music

DURING THE COURSE of a London engagement, Artur Schnabel, the German pianist-composer, gave an interview to one of the music critics on the *Observer*. His views are definite and, for the present day, original. Although he admits that his own programmes are unique he describes them as 'boring all the way through.' He says no performer plays *down* to an audience: 'They *like* the music they play, although they may wish they didn't. When they play better things they *ascend* for the time being. I judge a man's musical taste by his habitual level, not by his occasional heights.'

A vein of sardonic humor runs through much of Schnabel's conversation. He particularly enjoyed a provincial British newspaper that complained of the serious music he played. 'What do the English mean by "serious music"?' he inquired with mock astonishment. 'Do they mean just *music?*' Schnabel does not hold with the popular belief that a man's art has nothing to do with his character and he takes Wagner as a case in point:—

> Really great music does not present feelings and emotions nakedly. It sublimates them. It raises them to a spiritual region which it is the peculiar function of music to attain. There is plenty of music which does not do that. But such music is inferior. It presents us with emotions that we can, as it were, see and touch. But the really great musician, such as Beethoven, deepens and heightens these emotions so that they become spiritual. His music belongs to the world of the spirit. Wagner, in comparison, worked from his skin. Wagner, in fact, exploited the great nineteenth-century invention of nervousness. Nervousness was unknown before the nineteenth century. Wagner's music was made possible by this great invention. Nothing like it was known before. And as nervousness is something altogether inferior to spirituality, Wagner's music, in comparison with Beethoven's, is *cheap*. The last of the really great musicians was Schubert.

His interviewer then quoted Einstein's remark that the finer speculations of modern science spring from the religious instinct, but that modern art is worthless because there is no religion in it. 'That only means that Einstein doesn't like modern art,' Schnabel replied. 'He probably knows very little about it. He is right about the religious impulse, but he is wrong in supposing that modern artists do not possess it. A man knows when he is working in the region of art. A jazz composer, such as Irving Berlin, knows perfectly well that he is not an artist. His ability may be greater than that of some genuine artists, but he knows he is not employing it in the region of art.'

Although we have no Beethoven in our midst, Schnabel does not despair. 'Don't forget that the mediocrities of Beethoven's day are dead and forgotten, whereas ours are alive and insistent. The *general* level in Beethoven's time may have been no higher than in our own, but we see his time in a perspective where only peaks remain. There are serious artists living even to-day.'

Because phonograph reproduction leaves much to be desired, Schnabel refuses to make records, but he hopes to put his talents to educational uses by founding a school of piano playing. Music he regards as Europe's great contribution to modern art and in consequence he takes his own gifts with becoming seriousness. 'Do you realize,' he inquired, 'that music is the one original contribution that Europe has made to the mind of the world? Painting, sculpture, literature all existed before. So did science. But music, what we understand

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by music, is a new thing. It has opened up a world that was never known before. It is very important.' No wonder he feels that such an art should demand all that is best from even the best of us.

The New 'Daily Herald'

DURING THE TEN YEARS that have passed since the War the *Daily Herald* has been the only London newspaper that has set forth the views of the Labor Party. Operated at a loss and subsidized by the Trades Union Congress, it has never adequately expressed, either in content or appearance, the great political cause to which it is dedicated. But all this has changed now. The former proprietors of the *Herald* have made a deal with the large and prosperous publishing firm of Odhams whereby the editorial policy of the paper will continue to be directed by the Trades Union Congress, but Odhams will control 51 per cent of the stock and supply not only the cash but also the various stunts that make modern newspapers profitable. Yet the result of this collaboration can hardly be described as happy. The pages, to be sure, have been increased to normal newspaper size and there is much more advertising in them than the old *Herald* used to carry. Special insurance benefits are promised to regular readers and sensational accounts of the drug traffic as well as hot racing tips are being featured. Only the news columns and editorial pages continue to reflect a strictly Laborite point of view.

The *Times* has greeted its reconstituted rival somewhat contemptuously. Although nearly all news dispatches in the British press are colored by the political sympathies of the paper in which they appear, the *Times* goes out of its way to warn the *Herald*, which is still the only Labor paper in the land, against 'the perpetual stream of class hatred' that has been running through its columns, asserting that 'our English folk are not natural haters either as a nation or by classes.' The editors of the *Herald* do not, however, seem to have taken this advice to heart—and indeed one wonders why they should. They have exploited the discontent of the British working class so successfully that they now find themselves supported by a powerful group of capitalists who seem to believe that there is money in political agitation. Had the *Times* confined its criticisms to the atrocious appearance of the paper and its sloppy treatment of the news, that would have been one thing. But to object to its only asset is to be something very much less than magnanimous.

Pirandello's New One

MILAN AUDIENCES have been greeting with great enthusiasm a new play by Luigi Pirandello, *Come tu mi vuoi* (*As You Want Me*). The thoroughly characteristic plot deals with an Italian woman of no identity who was taken prisoner by the Austrians during the War and ten years afterward finds herself earning a living in the cabarets of Berlin. A German of perverted tastes falls in love with her and, to prove his devotion, expels his wife and daughter and gives his new inamorata the name of Helma—though not his own name. Presently, however, she becomes disgusted with her way of life and when she is approached one evening in her cabaret by an Italian who insists that her name is Signora Lucia and that she is the wife of his dearest friend, Signor Piera, she consents to go away with him.

Four months later she has become Signora Lucia Piera, having learned from her supposed husband and his circle of friends the habits, tastes, and ideas of his first wife. 'I will make myself as you want me to be,' she announces, and all goes well until the sister of the true Lucia puts forward claims to her brother-in-law's estates, asserting that his real wife is dead. The false Lucia thus comes to suspect that her supposed husband has merely used her as a means of retaining the property. At this juncture, her cast-off German admirer appears with a poor demented woman who seems to be the real Lucia. Everyone protests, but the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

heroine announces that she is an impostor and goes off with the German, recognizing that she is simply exchanging one immoral way of life for another.

The inspiration for this tale came from the celebrated case of Professor Canella, which has been interesting the Italian public for years and which centres about a man who lost his memory during the War and whose family has tried to reclaim him. The treatment of the situation, however, is Pirandello's own and embodies the essence of his philosophy. Facts mean nothing—only beliefs matter, and the individual is what he appears to be, nothing more. We all assume given personalities and act accordingly, but not all of us are quite so funny as the people in a Pirandello play. If we were, perhaps life might be a little more amusing than it is—and his plays a little truer to it.

Talkies in Germany

THE TALKING-PICTURE vogue in Germany is rapidly affecting the language of the nation as well as its film technique. A recent operetta called the *Liebeswalzer* built its theme song around the familiar Americanism, 'O.K.,' which is rendered in German as *'Oh Kä';* the photographers who take these pictures are invariably referred to as 'camera men'; and the world of sport, which the movies have helped to make even more popular, has now added 'groggy' to its already extensively Anglicized vocabulary. The success of the *Liebeswalzer* has led many critics to prophesy that just as the musical play had its origin in Vienna, so the film operetta of the future will come from German studios. An attractive young lady named Lilian Harvey, who knows both German and English perfectly, is expected to become highly popular as an international star, and the German producers are keeping their eyes on the American market by making their heroes citizens of the United States.

But there are other tendencies also at work. Russian influence is making itself felt in the introduction of amateurs to the talking screen—amateurs, that is, to the art of acting but professionals in the rôles which they assume. A celebrated newspaper editor, for instance, has been engaged to portray for the films the part that he fills in real life and thus furnish an atmosphere of verisimilitude. Another development is the hiring of average young people to perform before the camera the same routine that they follow in their daily lives. An experimental studio in Berlin has just released a film entitled *Menschen am Sonntag* showing how the white-collar population of a big modern city spends its Sundays picnicking in the woods. Meanwhile, the more ambitious Mr. Eisenstein of Russia has been attempting a similar production on a much more ambitious scale depicting the development of the collective-farming movement. He shows the pernicious capitalist system ruining the unfortunate peasants, who are saved, finally, by the Soviet Commission, which dispossesses the rich individual and splits up the land for the common good. With Russian technique influencing them on one side and American markets tempting them on the other, the talkie producers of Germany are in a position to combine the artistic and the profitable.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

All's well with Ireland, especially now that President Cosgrave has received a vote of confidence from the Dail. Mr. Gwynn, a native son, describes how much better the Free State has done than anybody expected that it would.

An Irishman *on* Ireland

By STEPHEN GWYNN

From the *Spectator*
London Conservative Weekly

GOVERNMENT HAS BEEN thoroughly established in Ireland, whether Free State or Six Counties. There is settled order. The country is tranquil and peaceable, debts are recoverable as well as anywhere else, there are plenty of good roads and transport services. Lord Craigavon's ministry and Mr. Cosgrave's have this much to show for their tenure of office. But it would be too much to say that parliamentary government is working smoothly and normally either in Free State or Northern Ireland. Neither part has seen a change of government accomplished, and in each part the governing authority insists that a transfer of power to the opposition would mean revolutionary change.

That is quite natural, though by no means quite healthy. Readers of Mr. Oliver's political essay, 'The Endless Adventure,' will remember that he blames Sir Robert Walpole, the politician statesman (about whose career the essay with its many generalizations is constructed), because the Whig leader, instead of trying to win Jacobite Tories to peaceful acceptance of the Hanoverian régime, constantly insisted that they were Jacobites before they were Englishmen. The result was long monopoly of power for the party which Walpole succeeded in representing as the only guarantee of settled order. Much was lost, and Mr. Oliver blames the statesman; though he recognizes that the politician was skillful in attaining his proper end—the tenure of power.

Lord Craigavon has succeeded, and, to all appearance, will continue

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to succeed, in convincing the Protestant people of Northern Ireland that if he is replaced by a combination of Labor and Nationalists (the only possible alternative in sight), the result will be to sacrifice Northern Ireland's separate position, and to unite all Ulster with the Free State—which in the belief of many of Lord Craigavon's supporters would mean a disastrous Catholic ascendancy. In the Free State, Mr. Cosgrave and his colleagues continually maintain that if Mr. de Valera's party came into power the Treaty of 1921 would be torn up and Ireland would be once more at strife with Great Britain. The apprehension of this weighs heavily on all those in the Free State who are not prepared for a new revolutionary change. As a consequence, both in North and South there is a certain lack of confidence in the stability of our existing order. This does not make for happiness and I should not call Ireland a happy country, politically speaking, either North or South. Discontent with the ruling authorities is normal and natural; parliamentary government presupposes and counts on it; but discontent becomes unhealthy when people do not see their way to a change. It turns to sourness.

THIS does not mean that Ireland is in a state of misery or depression. It is still a country where people have a good time; where, indeed, everybody seems to have time to burn; where numbers of gentlemen and ladies with incomes of three to five hundred a year can ride to hounds and go well; and where nobody with a few hundred a year is badly off, because so few are much better off. The essence of pleasure does not lie in what it costs. But politically speaking, Ireland has not been a happy country since Queen Elizabeth's day, except, of course, for the ruling class—the ascendancy. They had too good a time—and the end was a revolution, drawn out over two generations, and culminating brusquely and bloodily. Revolutions do not immediately tend to produce happiness. The Northeast in a sense did not experience revolution, since there Protestant ascendancy is still a fact; but it is the ascendancy of a majority. Nevertheless, the Protestant Northeast also feels the partition of Ireland as a thing unnatural, and the Free State Government might have done much to help this sentiment to a practical issue. It has done nothing of the kind. Its extravagant insistence on giving the teaching of Gaelic a dominant place in education has estranged northern Protestant opinion, which at best has little sympathy with this movement. By its virtual refusal to allow a site in the City of Dublin to be chosen for the War memorial it has alienated the ex-service men, whose organization knows no frontier and to whose memorial all parts of Ireland subscribed; and in other matters touching sentiment it has certainly not made for union with the North. Still less has it by the announced policy of defeating by legislation a conceded right; for it is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

made plain that if a subject shall carry an appeal, as in certain cases he legally may, from the Irish Court to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and shall succeed, the Free State Government will legislate—as it legally may—to give effect to the finding of the Irish Court.

It is perfectly true that Mr. Cosgrave, Mr. Blythe, and most of their colleagues have fervently and, I believe, sincerely expressed their desire to work for the union of Ireland; yet all these measures stereotype partition; and it must be said that the manner in which they are publicly expounded by ministers leaves much to be desired. The way to union with Ulster should be through the Protestant minority in the South, and southern Unionists have throughout supported Mr. Cosgrave. Their support might have been made more cordial; at one time it was becoming so. Now, I think, it has become less so; and in so far as it is continued, it will be only because Mr. de Valera seems a more objectionable alternative.

THIS is only natural, though it is not quite just. Recent irritation in politics often obliterates generous feelings. Dispassionate observers can still remember how desperate was the task to which Mr. Cosgrave and his half dozen colleagues, unknown and untried young men, set themselves seven years ago, and are grateful to the President for his courage, for his shrewdness, and for much generosity to old opponents. They recognize that in those seven years much more has been accomplished than the restoration of order. The road system of the country has been remodeled with admirable thoroughness. In the harnessing of the Shannon for electric power a great and bold enterprise was set on foot and is now coming to fruition. It is assumed that already within a few months after the start nearly half of the total power available is contracted for, and that in all probability 1932 will see Ireland faced with the necessity of still further extending this source of native power—as can be done by the projected extension of the embankment scheme. Much of this hopefulness is due to the fact that the rapidly growing Ford factory in Cork is to be run exclusively by electric power from the Shannon. Further, it should be generally observed, in Ireland and out of Ireland, that one of Mr. Cosgrave's colleagues, Mr. Hogan, has proved himself, in the judgment of Sir Horace Plunkett, the best minister of agriculture in Europe; and that under his guidance the Free State's main industry is moving slowly upward out of the trough into which the depression from 1920 onward plunged it. The country was understocked and ill-stocked; now the number of its cattle has increased, but still more the quality of them. That is the best barometer. There is no sign that Ireland will be a rich land; but on the other hand she runs no grave risks. Her position, economically and politically, is being steadily consolidated.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It has taken ten years for Austria to become once again a force to be reckoned with in international affairs. Chancellor Johann Schober is the man principally responsible for this change.

Schober *of* AUSTRIA

By MARCEL DUNAN

Translated from *L'Europe Nouvelle*
Paris Foreign-Affairs Weekly

WHEN THE PRESIDENT of the Austrian federal police, Johann Schober, who had already held the post of chancellor from June, 1921, to May, 1922, agreed to head the government last November, his country seemed to be on the eve of political bankruptcy just as it had been on the eve of financial bankruptcy before the League of Nations intervened in 1922. The electoral body, divided into two almost equal groups, seemed incapable of ending the increasingly bitter contest between the right- and left-wing parties without resorting to violence. The Socialist riots of July, 1927, when partisans of the extreme left tried to make up for their lack of parliamentary power, ended in lamentable and useless bloodshed. To prevent a similar outburst the civic guards known as the *Heimwehr* were organized and newspapers of every country prophesied imminent civil war.

As if by a miracle Chancellor Schober stilled this tempest. Not only did the groups of Fascists give up their idea of a march on Vienna but a widespread feeling of security and order presently made itself felt. The Chancellor also prevented the collapse of one of the biggest Viennese banks, from which terrified depositors had withdrawn 50,000,000 shillings in the course of a few weeks. Within less than two months' time he persuaded the rival factions to make mutual concessions and brought about profound constitutional reforms that satisfied the demands of the *Heimwehr* and consolidated the central power.

With the reinforced authority that his first successes gave him, he set

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

about performing another of the delicate tasks that he had inherited from his predecessor, Streeruwitz,—the reconciliation between Italy and Austria. Here, too, his methods soon met with success. Mussolini, who had only recently been irritated by Austrian manifestations regarding his policy in the Tyrol, withdrew his veto from the Austrian loan which he had been blocking for the past two years.

With this prestige behind him, the Chancellor then appeared at the Second Hague Conference and there, too, he had to play a decisive part. Of all the many handicaps from which the new Austria was suffering and which made many alarmists doubt its powers of survival, the most fatal was perhaps its obligation to pay reparations. Now, however, the Great Powers were preparing to liquidate their financial claims arising from the War and Austria at last found her natural opportunity to escape from a position that everyone agreed was ridiculous. Ten years ago, when Europe and the whole world had to send food to Vienna and establish charities there and when considerable sums of money had to be advanced to the struggling republic, no one expected that this little ruined state would be able to do more than pay back slowly the credit it had been granted. None the less the Reparations Commission paralyzed Austria's efforts, and it is a great success for Chancellor Schober to have obtained at the Second Hague Conference the definite annulment of Austrian reparation obligations.

HIS first words to the members of the Government who met him at the station were: 'And now let us get to work.' He has, therefore, again attacked the economic situation, which assumed a very threatening aspect during the winter. More than a quarter of the working population is unemployed and the official number of men out of work mounted from 167,000 at the end of November to 226,000 at the end of December and to 273,000 at the end of January. At the present time more than 300,000 workers and clerks are being supported by the state, on top of its habitual army of regular employees. The unemployment situation in Austria is, of course, partly the result of the general production crisis that prevails throughout the Old World and which has not spared Germany and England, where conditions are very different.

Nevertheless, in Austria's case there are special reasons for her difficulties and they must be remedied at once. On the one hand, the country is being compelled to meet extraordinary fiscal and social charges that are increasing production costs and are paralyzing the competitive ability of its industries. Perhaps the working population suffers from a certain lack of zeal but, on the other hand, there are international causes for these conditions, in particular the customs barriers which are blocking Austrian products.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ever since the birth of the new Austria the country has suffered from an adverse trade balance in relation to all the countries in the world except Italy and Yugoslavia. Its imports exceed its exports, but it is the exchange of goods between Austria and Germany that represents the most serious deficit. During the past year German imports into Austria have exceeded Austrian exports to Germany by 340,000,000 shillings, a third of the total trade deficit and an increase of more than 100,000,000 shillings over the previous year. When we remember all the fuss that is made about the fraternal sentiments and common national feelings of these two German states we may well be surprised that after two years of negotiations Vienna and Berlin could only agree upon a commercial treaty that was less advantageous to Austria than the ones she had made with Czechoslovakia and France. The key to the present situation lies in the conclusion of commercial agreements as favorable as the treaties made in 1927 and 1928 with Prague and Paris, and a treaty of this nature with Berlin is of paramount importance. But even apart from foreign markets there is a development of domestic markets that can be pursued and Austria expects to spend all of her next foreign loan in developing immense public utilities.

ALL this explains why the Chancellor followed up his visit to the Hague last January by trips to Rome and to Berlin. In Rome he had to cement friendly relations with Italy in order to assure himself of an Italian loan and of various economic agreements that the traditional tendencies of Central European exchanges render almost necessary. The Chancellor was greeted at Rome with a warmth of cordiality that wiped out many evil memories. A treaty of friendship, conciliation, and arbitration was signed. Mussolini offered his new friend a silver representation of the River Tiber. The King then bestowed on him the great cordon of the Order of Saint Maurice and Saint Lazarus and the Pope presented him with one of his gold jubilee medals. Herr Schober also received a political gift in the form of an amnesty to all victims of Italianization in the upper Adige valley. But did he not perhaps push things even further? No sooner had he arrived at Rome than accusations began to rain about him showing that both Germany and the Little Entente were suspicious. His German adversaries announced: 'He is betraying the German cause by throwing himself into the arms of Latin Fascists who have persecuted the Tyrol.' The Little Entente pointed out that the eastern Alps in Austria control the route which would allow Italy to enter Hungary and execute a military manœuvre against Yugoslavia. Even while he was still in Rome Schober had to issue denials of any new political designs on the part of his government or of any intention of entering a combination directed against some third

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

party or against the peace of Europe. On his way back he therefore arranged to preside over an Austro-Yugoslavian festival inaugurating the frontier bridge at Radkersburg, but the suspicions aroused by his visit to Rome were revived by the news that a big road for automobile tourists is being opened across Styria and Carinthia, and that military experts are describing this as a link between Italy and Hungary.

Before going on to Berlin to dissipate the fears that his visit to Rome had aroused, Herr Schober received in Vienna a member of the Hungarian government, Count Klebelsberg, Minister of Public Instruction. Officially, to be sure, the latter had come to give a lecture at the Austrian Academy of Science and to inspect some of its institutions, at a time when Count Bethlen, the Hungarian minister of foreign affairs, was detained in Paris. None the less this educational visit promptly aroused suspicion when Count Klebelsberg was invested with Austria's grand cordon of merit. Furthermore, it was discovered that Count Bethlen, on his way back to Budapest, stopped off in Vienna on the pretext of being sick. All this aroused fresh suspicion of Austrian policy and forced the government at Vienna to continue its declarations of neutrality and friendship toward all.

WITH the visit to Berlin the plot began to thicken. The Chancellor, whose patriotism makes him a kind of traveling salesman for the house of Austria, encountered two dangers. If he were looked upon as a convinced Austrian, this would be a defect in the eyes of the northern Germans and his economic demands might not be granted. If, on the other hand, he were greeted as a brother, Europe could assert that he was trying to unite his country with Germany.

The fact is that the visits of the Chancellor to the Hague, to Rome, and to Berlin have succeeded in making Austria once more a factor in international politics, a rôle that she has not played since 1918. Freed from all expenses of war liquidation she has regained not only financial independence but the means to pursue an active foreign policy. It is now up to Austria to show that she understands more than ever that her interests coincide with the interests of European peace and that she must have no back thoughts and no regrets. Chancellor Schober will sooner or later have opportunity to show how good a European he really is by following his visits to Rome and Berlin with visits to the two other great capitals, Paris and London, whose statesmen supported him at the Hague as thoroughly as the Italians did and whose good will is equally necessary for the great foreign loan he has in view. Such journeys cannot be suddenly improvised and he must study at his leisure the convenience of the various interested governments before he undertakes them.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Henry Ford is no benefactor. American industry is destroying the workingman. Such are the views of a German poet and dramatist just back from a tour of inspection through the Middle West.

FORD through German Eyes

By ERNST TOLLER

Translated from the *Berliner Tageblatt*
Berlin Liberal Daily

AT FIRST I BELIEVED that the American workingman was incomparably better off than the German and that he made much more money. Soon, however, I saw prosperity's other side. America was the great victor in the War. She conquered Europe's markets and her production mounted immeasurably. Unemployment did not exist and wages were high. Everyone hoped to be able to make enough in a few years to buy his own house, his own automobile, and his own little tract of land. The saying, 'every man has a chance,' soon came to mean 'every man can get rich' and it was universally believed. Everyone speculated, bootblacks, elevator men, laborers, barbers, artists. The Stock Exchange listings were the most important part of the newspapers. If a stock rose or fell a few points, it was a much more interesting event than any development in European politics. One's savings might double overnight and everything seemed possible in this country of gigantic dimensions where fresh changes and developments were occurring every day.

Nothing grew old. Buildings fifteen or twenty stories high were torn down within ten years and skyscrapers of forty or fifty stories were put up in their places. No sooner was a new automobile road finished than artificial brooks, forests, and fields were constructed beside it. The owning class, a cleverer group than their colleagues in Europe, supported the speculative frenzy and offered their workers shares of stock

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at low prices. They interested large groups of employees in profit-sharing systems. They created the illusion of coöperation between labor and capital. In certain enterprises, the workers own as much as 25 per cent of the stock. To-day, however, things are beginning to change. A full-fledged industrial crisis is occurring of which the Stock Exchange collapse was only one symptom. In certain industries, notably the automobile business, a critical stage has already been reached.

Compared with Germany, the American wage level is extraordinarily high. Many workers receive thirty, thirty-eight, and forty cents an hour, but others receive as much as $1.50. The building trades, machinery makers, and printers are paid the highest wages. I myself have lived with a number of American workingmen. They own individual houses that we should undoubtedly call little 'villas' in Germany and they have excellent sleeping and living rooms, kitchens, Frigidaire ice chests, and bathrooms. Their furniture is uniform and what we should call 'middle class.' Every house has a radio, a phonograph, and often an electric piano. American workers eat better than their German comrades. They have grown used to comfort and now expect it as a matter of course. They own automobiles, and not only second-hand cars or Fords but expensive makes costing $1,000 or $1,200. In one family that I visited in Rochester the daughters all worked but the family owned two automobiles, one of which belonged to the father and the other to the eldest daughter. They only have to pay a few dollars in taxes and gasoline costs half what it does in Germany.

BUT now for the other side of the picture. When an American worker falls sick or loses his job he has virtually no protection. He must spend his savings and presently finds himself thrown back on private charity. Not all workers are like those who took me in as their guest. I also visited many miserable dwelling places. Near Pittsburgh I saw some hundred thousand employees of the great Bethlehem Steel Corporation living in tenements as dirty and devoid of comfort as our own slums in the Ruhr district. It is significant that the steel and mine workers, who have to perform the hardest kind of labor, receive the lowest wages.

A woman in Pittsburgh connected with a private charitable organization took me about and showed me various 'cases.' One man had been working seventeen years for one company and making regular deposits in the private insurance fund that the company maintained, but when he fell sick he only received his insurance benefit for a short time. One of the factory officials and the factory doctor announced that his sickness had not been contracted during his working hours and he was, therefore, given no more money. That man is now sitting idle at home with his wife and six little children and he would literally be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

starving to death if he had not been fortunate enough to become a 'case' for charitably inclined ladies. But how many people are not 'cases'? The present crime wave can only arise from a widespread condition of misery.

American labor unions are much more docile than ours, yet many factories forbid them entirely, Ford included. I visited Ford's plant. Two men who had worked there for a year showed me about. As soon as we entered the reception building, a special guide was put in charge of us, a former American officer who had lost his arm in the War. We climbed into a bus and were taken first of all to the factory. Imagine a vast room with thousands of men packed tightly together, each at his own bench, working under frightfully noisy conditions. Close above their heads belts are running on rollers and each man performs one motion eight hours a day, the same motion time after time.

All the 125,000 Ford employees work eight hours a day. The day is divided into three shifts and no one is allowed to speak, smoke, or sit down. Even the foremen must stand up eight hours. If anyone wants to leave his task, he must raise his hand like a schoolboy and wait until the overseer can put a reserve worker in his place. But woe unto the man who is being replaced if he exchanges so much as three words with the man who is replacing him, for he will be punished or perhaps discharged at once. The punishment consists of not allowing the man to work for a certain number of days or weeks. That is the hardest penalty a worker can pay for it prevents him from earning anything and when he returns he may well be given a different place at lower wages.

In one factory near Philadelphia, the name of which I have forgotten, workers who arrive at their appointed places a minute ahead of time for a week get two hours' extra pay but if they are one minute late they are docked six hours' pay.

All factories are seething with private police and spies who control the destinies of the workers. The private police are dressed like municipal police. Although they do not theoretically enjoy the same constitutional rights, they assume them and carry clubs and revolvers. If they see a worker infringing any of the factory regulations, they arrest him and take him to the office.

EVERY worker in Ford's plant has fifteen minutes in which to eat, but there are no special eating rooms. In the dusty factory workshops, reeking with all kinds of chemicals, lunch counters have been established at which the workers can buy a package of lunch for twenty-five cents, including two sandwiches, some fruit, a paper cup of soup, and a pot of coffee, that they consume sitting on the floor. The white-collar men,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on the other hand, have clean eating rooms especially constructed for them. They come in to a long counter, take a tray, plate, and eating utensils, and set the tray on two bars that run along the edge of a buffet table from which they take whatever kind of soup, meat, vegetable, salad, or dessert they wish. Finally they come to the cashier, who looks over each tray of food, rings up the charge, and hands each man a slip showing how much he must pay before he leaves the room. Why does not Henry Ford build similar eating rooms for his hand workers? There are refined psychological reasons. The white-collar men do not receive more money. They are paid by the week just the same way and many hand workers actually receive higher wages. However, the self-respect of the white-collar men is fed in this clever manner.

Ford's minimum wage is $6.00 a day, and the working week is five days long. Many other factories, too, have adopted the five-day week, and in New York 200,000 men work only that long. Certain workers receive as much as $70 to $75 a week but lately, since the big trade slump has begun, Ford is dismissing his more highly paid employees. Such dismissals could not occur in Germany, where specific rules and regulations require that a man be put on half time for a certain period before he is definitely dismissed. In America, however, thousands of unsuspecting workers may come to their jobs in the morning and find themselves in the street at night. Yet, in spite of these conditions, thousands upon thousands of men of every country and every race want to get work with Henry Ford. The tasks they perform are so mechanical that even the most unskilled man can master them within half an hour. Often at eleven o'clock at night men are beginning to line up at the entrance of the employment bureau and by morning thousands of people seeking work are crowded about the factory. If no help is needed a sign is hung out, 'No places to-day,' and if the men who are looking for work do not leave within an hour water is sprayed on them with a fire hose.

Not only did I see Ford's factory but I also saw the steel mills in which he makes his own steel and the glass factory where he makes his own windshields. I saw a pile of rusty metal as high as a mountain consisting of 196 scrapped warships that Ford had bought cheap from the government to melt down the metal of which they were made.

My kindly guide informed me that no women are employed in Ford's factories. He told me that Henry Ford thinks that women should look out for their husbands and keep house. These guides are excellent propaganda agents. 'Do all the men work by daylight?' I asked mine. 'Sure,' he replied, but later I saw workshops with lamps in them that cast a green glow over the faces of the men.

'Is it as clean as this in every workshop?' I asked him on another occasion. 'Sure,' he replied but presently I saw the place where they

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sprayed the automobiles with paint. It was odorous and unhealthy and all the workers wore masks over their faces. But when my guide informed me that 73 per cent of the Ford employees own their own homes and 78 per cent own their own automobiles, I in my turn answered, 'Sure.'

BEFORE I left the factory I saw the room where all the various parts of the automobiles are finally put together and the finished product is driven out under its own power by one of the workers. Agents are stationed here who take over the completed automobiles. Ford only makes as many motor cars as are ordered and paid for. Each day about 600 automobiles leave his factory.

I said farewell to my guide and walked out of the factory. A new shift was just going on and thousands of workers were streaming out of the buildings. I looked at their faces. None of them seemed undernourished, but all of them wore an indescribably tired, exhausted expression and when they sat down on the street cars and buses many of them fell asleep at once. Mechanized labor may possess great social significance in so far as it saves superfluous work, but if it turns a man into an inanimate hammer or lever its gains become doubtful. This danger can only be diminished if no one has to work more than eight hours a day and if everyone can pursue some creative activity in his free time. It is bad enough for a man to know nothing whatever of his work, but it is worse still if he is turned into an inanimate machine repeating the same gesture again and again. In the Ford factory no one can leave his place or go to another part of the building. The result is that a man may spend his whole life executing the same hammer stroke on the same part of an automobile without ever seeing with his own eyes the completed automobiles on which he has labored.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Professor Ferrero does not agree with Mussolini's views on democracy and for that reason has left home. His reputation as an historian lends weight to his hopeful views on world affairs.

Ferrero *for* Democracy

By G. HUBERT-RODIER

Translated from the *Revue Bleue*
Paris Literary and Political Semimonthly

GUGLIELMO FERRERO is in Paris, which is a real sign of the times. He is our greatest consultant physician on those political diseases from which our social body suffers periodically; indeed, he is perhaps the greatest diagnostician Europe has produced since de Tocqueville.

No man is more zealous than he in working for peace, international understanding, and the League of Nations. At the present time, when the various nations have so recently sent messengers of peace to the Hague on a crusade for universal concord, it is well to explain why Ferrero feels that the future of democracy has raised the problem of peace in a new and more imperative fashion than ever before. Ferrero's work has developed about a central theme, the theme of progress, which he first touched upon when he was writing his history of Rome. While the Roman star was rising and shedding its light on ever more extensive surfaces of the earth, the writers of the day described the period as one of decadence. From the century of Augustus to the time of the Antonines they spoke only of corruption and kept regretting the candid and heroic times of Numa. These censors of the new morals were unconsciously raising the whole moral problem of progress: does progress reside in the prudent ideal of qualitative perfection or in the unlimited ideal of quantitative power? Does it involve the development of an élite class to the highest possible pitch or the raising of the standard of living of the masses? Does it mean the primacy of spiritual things or the primacy of economic things? Is it the pursuit of culture or the pur-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

suit of justice? The definition that one chooses determines one's philosophy of history.

EXPRESSED in terms of progress, how do the problems of democracy and of peace in democratic states present themselves? What is democracy in its essence? It is a way of laying our political foundations by placing political power in the hands of a delegation. Through a kind of social pact the inhabitants of a modern state delegate political powers to certain individuals who are held responsible to public opinion and who thus may be withdrawn from office.

The idea of the delegation of power supersedes the idea of power exercised through divine right, the conception on which the monarchies and oligarchies of ancient times were based. In those days people did not believe that human families were of the same nature because they did not believe that they had the same origin. Certain people were said to be descended from gods or demigods. The Roman emperors were apotheosized after death and worshiped as *divi*—divine beings. The dynastic kings of France and England were looked upon by their subjects as sacrosanct personages who manifested their holy nature by their miraculous ability to cure scrofula and to bless certain rings to ward off attacks of epilepsy. It was a belief in divine origin that enabled noble families to assert their right to govern docile plebeians.

This belief Christianity destroyed by proclaiming that all men were the children of God and by asserting that Jews and Gentiles, barbarians and Romans, slaves and freemen were all equal heirs to the promises made unto Abraham. After Christianity no real aristocracy survived, except in so far as the belief in paganism and barbarous customs continued to live in certain countries, particularly in Germany. Thus Christianity was the great factor in promoting democracy throughout the world, a fact that was recognized as soon as a man of the people happened to reflect, 'In paradise where will this gentleman be?'

In proclaiming the equal rights of man, and, as a corollary, the equal rights of all citizens; in defining individual liberty as a certain number of natural, inalienable rights, democracy, a kind of lay Christianity, has promoted an ideal of dignity and justice. That is its imperishable honor and it is that achievement that should be emblazoned in letters of gold. Let us, however, also investigate certain other democratic formulas.

THROUGH universal suffrage, democracy has placed the government of states in the hands of the masses. For the diplomacy of princely courts it has substituted the rule of public opinion, which is affective, credulous, mobile, and passionate. It has also conferred upon public

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

opinion an empire of unlimited extent. Kings were continually checked by the organic laws of their kingdoms, by the privileges of the nobility, the clergy, and the parliament, and they were unable to gather many taxes, or to raise many recruits. The French monarchy of the eighteenth century died of constitutional impotence, but a democratic government knows no such obstacles. Law, supposedly the expression of the general will, is accepted in that capacity by all as the express incarnation of the will of every individual.

For this reason, its jurisdiction knows no bounds. A democratic state can mobilize all its able-bodied adults, it can take from its citizens eighty per cent of their individual fortunes without giving them any ground for complaint, since in principle the state is merely decreeing what they desire. Thus democracy, putting itself in the service of a quantitative ideal, creates modern warfare. Democracy lessens the chances of war but increases its dangers by rendering war more formidable when it comes. It diminishes the chances of war because the citizens of a democratic state, knowing that they will forfeit their own money and their own lives, refuse to enter wars of prestige and dignity such as the old-fashioned royal courts used to wage. But democracy makes war more formidable because through conscription it has transformed professional armies into armed nations.

Sovereigns of the old régime maintained professional armies whose lives were husbanded because they were difficult to replace. Made up of career soldiers, these armies created tactics and strategies that were, above all, the art of making war in accordance with certain rules of honor, war of only limited horror that respected the rights of individuals.

Democracy has created mass levies of troops and armed entire nations. It is abolishing all distinctions between the civil and the armed population. The civil population of occupied territories is requisitioned to perform forced labor. Napoleon's enemies were right when they said of his practice of letting his troops live off the country through which they were marching: 'That is not the way one makes war.' Democratic war is no longer an art hedged round about with laws of humanity and courtesy. It has become a form of universal slaughter in which all the belligerent powers engage to the full extent of their resources.

Europe had no experience with democratic warfare on a great scale until 1914. The revelation that came at that time has aroused such horror that our continent is ready to make the greatest sacrifices of pride and ambition in order to secure peace based on security, arbitration, and disarmament. Another war would mean the end of Western civilization. Such is the teaching of Guglielmo Ferrero. Such is the lesson that our statesmen must meditate at the Hague, at Geneva, and at London, where they should try to declare war on war and realize for the second time in history the ancient majesty of august peace.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Rome has its censorship no less than Boston. A militantly Protestant British scholar attacks the latest edition of the Papal Index of Forbidden Books.

The New Papal Index

By G. G. COULTON

From the *Nineteenth Century and After*
London Literary and Political Monthly

THERE ARE FEW BODIES which know so little of their own past, beyond those particular things which it is convenient they should know, as the Roman Catholics. And nothing is so directly responsible for this ignorance as the system of censorship, culminating in the *Index Librorum Prohibitorum*. The emperor Augustus, so Tacitus tells us, was the first in Rome to legislate against written or spoken words, as apart from deeds. This may not mean all that it seems to mean at first sight; unpopular talk was doubtless often punished by the populace without formal law. But at least it indicated, roughly, a universal tendency in politics. A government strong in its appeal to human nature and common sense can afford to grant much license of speech; a government uncertain in its foundations must be severe on that point, sometimes even to ferocity. And the governmental foundation may be shaky not only in itself, but relatively; there may be quite enough popular consent to support any ordinary authority, but dictatorial rule throws far more burden and stress upon such general consent, and must therefore rely proportionately upon artificial supports. The Roman emperors naturally committed themselves to this policy of censorship. The Christian Church, though it had not altogether waited until the State took it into partnership, inevitably became less tolerant of free speech in proportion as it imitated the imperial organization, and was able to appeal for support to the secular arm. In process of time, therefore, when the popes had advanced their claim to wield both swords,

Publication rights in America controlled by the Leonard Scott Publishing Company

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and had organized in the Inquisition a most elaborate machinery of repression, it became as dangerous for a man to speak freely his fullest thoughts as it is now, if report be true, in Moscow.

The stages of this natural progress are fairly simple. Gelasius I, in 494 and 496, was the first pope who can be said to have drawn up an index of prohibited books; his second decree was later incorporated in the *Corpus of Canon Law*. Gradually, after the barbarian invasions, when intellectual life revived, and heresies gained force, prohibitions multiplied. The Bible, especially, was fenced round; and, though no pope promulgated any explicit and universal decree forbidding its study by the common people, yet vernacular versions were so little encouraged at best, and so strictly condemned at the worst, that even Sir Thomas More, in that *Apology* against Tyndale in which he did all he could to justify this negative policy, confessed sadly that the positive side was being neglected, and that religion suffered from the lack of some authorized version which might take the place of the condemned Wycliffite Bible.

UNIVERSITY lectures had often been strictly censored in the Middle Ages. When, quite recently, Leo XIII suspected Monseigneur d'Hulst of teaching a philosophy other than that of Aquinas at the Institut Catholique of Paris, and when the Pope compelled the Monseigneur to go all the way to Rome and produce the actual manuscript of his lectures in exculpation, he was simply following mediæval methods. Moreover, so long as the Church could call upon the secular arm for support, the most direct methods were employed. As the *Catholic Encyclopædia* puts it, in its article on 'Censorship,' 'down to more recent times, forbidden books were got out of the way in the simplest manner, by destroying or confiscating them.' But with the invention of printing destruction became more difficult. That kind of university censorship which we have seen Leo XIII renewing was becoming insufficient then as it is insufficient now; the written and printed word began hopelessly to overflow the spoken word, and the new problem called for new methods. In 1559, for the first time, an official list of prohibited books for the whole world was printed in Rome. It has since passed through about a hundred editions and many forms; and here, at the end of 1929, we have the latest, furnished with every official guarantee. The preface, by a significant innovation, is now in vernacular Italian; and it will doubtless be translated officially into other tongues.

Hell, writes the Cardinal Secretary in his very first sentence, is now stirring against the Church a far more terrible battle than those of the earlier centuries, when martyrs sealed their faith with their blood.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For 'the evil press'—'*la stampa cattiva*'—is a more perilous weapon than the sword. Saint Paul, as we know, set the example of censorship; he caused evil books to be burned (Acts xix. 19). Saint Peter's successors have always followed this example; nor could they have done otherwise, for their Church, Infallible Mistress and sure guide of the Faithful, is bound in conscience to keep the press pure. Free will is one of God's greatest gifts to man; but it degenerates into libertinage in those men who are 'infected with that moral plague which goes by the name of "Liberalism." ' Civil governments have employed preventive censure, especially in recent times, 'with a rigor unknown to the Church'—an allusion, apparently, to the Soviet régime. Men have so misunderstood the Bible that 'popes and councils have more than once found themselves constrained to regulate, and even sometimes to prevent, the divulgation of the Scriptures in living languages.' On this point, however, the Church has been cruelly maligned: 'it would not be just to say that the Church has absolutely forbidden the Bible in the vulgar tongue; it is enough to recall the fact that, in the seventy years between the invention of printing and the publication of Luther's German version, more than two hundred editions of the Scriptures, in various current languages, duly approved by the Church, were disseminated among the peoples.'

But what authority can possibly be quoted for these 'two hundred editions'? There were, I believe, only twenty-one editions of the vernacular Bible in all Europe before Luther's: fourteen German, four Dutch, two Italian, and one French. We could, indeed, get up to two hundred or thereabout by counting every edition of the Psalter alone, or of the little volume containing just the Gospels and Epistles for mass; but what responsible person can maintain that such a volume constitutes an 'edition of Scripture,' or, as the meaning of '*Scrittura*' would be more exactly conveyed in English, 'of the Scriptures'? In that sense we carry two editions of the Scripture in one hand whenever we take a prayer book to church. It seems incredible that a statement so deceptive, if not so patently false, can be made in this solemn official publication, under the authority of a pope whose main pre-papal distinction was the librarianship of a great library, and whose suspicions as a bibliographer ought at once to have been aroused. Moreover, the second statement is worse than deceptive—it is categorically false; and, here again, it is a simple matter of bibliography. Not one of these twenty-one Bibles, I believe, bears the least mark of official approbation; on the contrary, we have every reason to believe that they were more or less contraband. For instance, a Latin Bible printed at Cologne in 1479 bears the approval of the university censor; a Dutch Bible printed there in 1480 bears no such token. No Roman Catholic critic, I believe, has ever ventured to impugn Miss Deanesly's

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

verdict that 'the printing of German Bibles was done without the approval of the Church.'

ONE of the most interesting studies is that of comparing the books pilloried with the books that have been spared, or, again, of following a condemned book until it is let loose again. Montaigne's essays have been forbidden to the faithful for centuries, and are forbidden still. That this is not a question of morals, but of dogma, is shown by the case of Rabelais, who was proscribed in 1559, but is now let loose upon the public. So is Boccaccio, though the early censors were troubled about him, especially at the Council of Trent. One of the shifts adopted was to publish an ecclesiastically authorized edition in which all the piquant indecencies remained, but the actors were transformed from priests and friars into lawyers and other laymen; a copy of this may easily be consulted at the British Museum, in which all the changes are carefully noted in ink. It may be pleaded that these authors are sufficiently forbidden by the general prohibition against immoral writings, but, in that case, why specify names at all in this random fashion? Balzac, who at one time was condemned *en bloc*, is now forbidden only where his novels treat of love: *omnes fabulæ amatoriæ*—a phrase which is applied to George Sand also. Certain earlier absurdities have certainly disappeared from this Index of 1929. We no longer find booksellers pilloried by mistake as authors, or whole lists taken at random from German Protestant booksellers' catalogues and mutilated by Italian printers; nor, again, is it now sinful to read the two orthodox bishops, Critius and Macer, who had combated Luther and had thus been mistaken for Lutherans by the random inquisitors who helped Paul IV to draw up his Index. Several time-honored names have been released also, as we have seen with Erasmus. Dante's *De Monarchia* may now be read without moral guilt; and the faithful have had permission for nearly a century to dip into the early astronomers—Kepler, Copernicus, and Galileo. Charles Darwin, strange to say, has never been condemned, though Erasmus Darwin's *Zoonomia* is still on the list. So also are a host of authors whom the world will never forget—Descartes, Spinoza, Malebranche, Kant, Bacon, Sir Thomas Browne, Locke, Hobbes, Gibbon, J. S. Mill, Taine, Bergson, Bossuet, Lord Acton, Döllinger, Samuel Richardson, Addison, Goldsmith, Heine, Victor Hugo, and, piquantly enough, one of the latest subjects of Roman canonization, the Blessed Roberto Bellarmine. Of course, not everything of all these men is condemned—Bossuet, for instance, only in one of his least known writings, and not in that monumental book in which he marshaled the historical evidence of the Catholic centuries against papal infallibility. Bellarmine, also, was condemned for one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

book only, and for a very short time; on the other hand, we must not forget those who have escaped the Index only by private influence.

If all this story reads rather like history from the moon, and if this Index of 1929, in one sense the newest thing of the moment, seems in another sense the most prehistoric, suggesting nothing but stale antiquarianism or idle curiosity, let us now consider the actual working of this system in our own day. Newman, the greatest Roman of them all, admitted freely that he found his fellow Romanists less educated than outsiders; some distinguished Frenchmen and Germans are ready to confess the same, but the ordinary apologist, especially the recent convert, always asks us to take his word for the contrary. Here and there you may find Roman Catholics enumerating, with some pride, the scholars for whom they claim world-wide, as apart from merely sectarian, eminence. Dr. Rifaux is, or was, an intellectual layman deeply concerned for the future of his Church. He enumerated in 1905, among its great men who could hold their own anywhere, ten biblical critics and theologians, eleven Church historians, twelve philosophers, six men of letters, and six scientists. Of these last I doubt whether even the name is known to the majority of living English scientists. Of the other thirty-three a startlingly large proportion have incurred, in virtue of their approach to the standards of non-Romanist scholarship, the serious disapproval of the hierarchy. Since 1905 eight have been actually put on the Index and five more have suffered almost equal degradation. One of the most distinguished, Mignot, Bishop of Albi, on the testimony of a friend, 'dared not reprint in a volume his letters to his clergy, lest the book should be put on the Index.' Another, Vacandard, the historian of the Inquisition, saw many inferior men put over his head, and died recently in comparative obscurity. Duchesne, the greatest of recent Roman Catholic Church historians, is on the Index; F. X. Kraus, almost as good a scholar, escaped it only by adopting pseudonyms and similar subterfuges. Brunetière, though not condemned by name, was so evidently struck at in person by Pius X in the encyclical *Pascendi* that it exposed him to insult and broke his heart. Ermoni was excommunicated, and died practically of starvation. Loisy's fate would have been similar if his talents and learning had not earned him a professorship in Paris when the Church cast him out. Lagrange has had writings officially condemned, and, unless he had submitted, would doubtless have been indexed. Thirty per cent, therefore, of these boasted Roman scholars have found it impossible to work without outstepping, sooner or later, the Roman limitations.

THESE facts accord ill with the frequent assurances we receive from within, and especially from converts. Mr. Leacock, in one of his most

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

amusing essays, describes his experiences with a medium. One great man after another is evoked—Napoleon, Lincoln, and so on—and each, through the medium, begins with the same stereotyped assurance: 'Oh! if only you knew what it is like to be here!' Somehow, however, uniformity fails to carry conviction; we feel here, what the pious Romanist Duggan has confessed, that there is something seriously deceptive in this outward unanimity displayed in the face of outsiders. Not that we need suspect personal insincerity: in the nature of the case, those who come forward to testify are a select few; and Messrs. Belloc and Chesterton and Knox (to name only three distinguished champions of the moment) may mean every word they say, yet convey a distorted impression of the whole system. It is a question of different idiosyncrasies and varying proportions. Nobody can study the Roman Church without realizing how great an institution it is in many directions, and how much scope it can afford to any soul that happens to be in preëstablished harmony with those particular directions. But not all of us are born to such preëstablished harmony; nor are we likely to find what some of these converts have found. There is no reason to question the substantial accuracy of their description of their own feelings on this point. For some minds, even though no such doctrines as the Roman had existed, it would have been necessary to invent them. And a great many others can play about within certain definite limitations without feeling the pinch of those limitations by personal experience. A bluebottle fly impresses us with thorough content and enjoyment in the freedom of an inn parlor. He runs up and down the window like a spark in the chimney; he threads an infinity of airy mazes round our head; he takes advantage of our baldness, but that adds piquancy to his sport; and we reflect that whatever seems least reasonable in his evolutions may, after all, be providentially ordained. Even in an inn parlor the bluebottle is among the most wonderful of God's creatures. Yet there are other flies who feel the irresistible need of open air and wider space, and who would far rather take the risk of a predatory swallow than of the spider's web and the slimy fly trap that crown the parlor ceiling.

Therefore, writers more distinguished even than the three already named have delivered their testimony in words which seem to agree far more exactly with ascertained and undeniable facts. Father Tyrrell was one of the most original English-speaking thinkers in the Roman Church since Newman; perhaps he exceeded all except Friedrich von Hügel, who himself owed immunity from the Index mainly to his social prestige and his prudent diplomacy. Tyrrell, when he left the Jesuits, wrote to his own general that Roman clerical education was out of date by three centuries, that the censorship was engineered by men 'who know literally nothing . . . of any *living* subject whatever'; and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that 'it would be indeed strange, or even miraculous, if such men had an intelligible answer to questions whose very terms they had studiously made themselves incapable of understanding.' In 1898 the Abbé Harrent wrote a book on *The Schools of Antioch* in the fourth century. His bishop demanded that he should submit it to the censor. He replied: 'I am not one of those who write history to order, and who are ready to falsify it in order to save what they call their "principles." ' The bishop insisted on his rights; Harrent resigned his benefice and left the Church. But such revolts, naturally, are very few in proportion. The Roman Catholic cleric has been carefully educated to be fit for no other livelihood; moreover, he, like the layman, is often very naturally and sincerely attached to the Church, even when he is most indignant with the hierarchy. His defection may mean the rupture of his strongest and oldest social ties; the sacrifice is enormous in money, in social prestige, and in human affection. That is why the large majority conform, even among those who have read enough and thought enough to feel the galling burden of this censorship.

A GERMAN contemporary, Mumbauer, expressed his sense of nausea and suffocation most emphatically. We Catholics, he wrote, are shut up in a Ghetto; we may not attend ordinary schools or universities; we must be taught by ourselves, separately from the rest of the world; the result is that civilization goes on its own way and leaves us shut up in our own back street. About the same time a number of German Catholics published a formal complaint demanding that they should no longer be outlawed, but allowed to mix freely with their fellowmen; and that, as a preliminary, the Index should be scrapped. Yet the answer to that was a new edition of the Index by Leo XIII; and now this republication of a few weeks ago, 'revised by command of His Holiness, Pope Pius XI' and with a vernacular preface. There, we discover that no Frenchman who values his soul may refer to that current modern encyclopædia in which he is most likely to find whatever information he needs on the spur of the moment, Larousse's *Grand Dictionnaire Universel*. It is piquant to note how many great French authors are forbidden by name, quite apart from those who are excluded by general rules, as adversaries or critics of the Roman faith. If it were really possible to deprive a whole nation of these books, and of the 'orthodox' books which owe most of their value to those forbidden predecessors, it is hardly too much to say that the result would be a population of dunces.

But, it will be answered, there is no such fear; the thing is physically impossible. That is true; and therein lies the best apology for the Index. A correspondent sends me his own experiences of many years in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Jesuit Order. Although the Cardinal repeats on page xvi, after the example of his predecessors, that these prohibitions hold good for every part of the world, and for every language into which the books may have been translated, yet my correspondent is certain that only the most insignificant minority of Romanists, in a free country like Britain, know the provisions of the Index. He instances Montaigne and the *Religio Medici*, concerning which the chief Jesuit organ in this country, the *Month*, has in recent times printed essays calculated to attract readers to those books; and he adds: 'I myself never knew that they were forbidden, and I am quite sure that my superiors had not the faintest idea of it.' But, however futile these rules may be in certain directions, the spirit which animates them is deadly for real learning. Most poisonous of all is its direct inheritance from the Middle Ages, when discipline rested on a foundation of spying and tale bearing. Just as it was accounted criminal in heretics not to have betrayed their fellows, and as the Inquisition was willing to welcome, or even at a pinch to compel, the evidence of a ten-year-old boy against his father, and as this is also the age-long tradition of many Roman Catholic schools and of all their seminaries, and as it formed an integral part of Pius X's anti-modernist campaign, so it is still enshrined in the most recent code of Canon Law, and is quoted from thence in the Cardinal's preface to our present Index (page xvi). All the faithful are bound in conscience to report to their bishop or to the pope whatever books they judge to be mischievous; and they are assured that the names of the informers will be kept under seal of secrecy. It must be borne in mind that no reason is ever given for the condemnation of any particular book; the damnatory sentence is peremptory and irresponsible, and the victim has no real chance of explanation. It is this 'stabbing in the back,' this deliberate encouragement of espionage and tale bearing, which arouses my correspondent's bitterest indignation, as it aroused that of Tyrrell and Barrett and Hoensbroech; moreover, this was one of the saddest disillusions under which Newman suffered, together with many other converts of his generation. Therefore, however inoperative this serio-comic list may be in detail, the pressure behind it is crushing. Even out of Newman it crushed half the life force. Not only may a bishop condemn writers by his own authority and force them practically to choose between falsification of their real opinions and revolt, but even the ordinary parish priest is commissioned to lay his leaden hand upon literature and science (page xxv). To quote for the third time from my correspondent, who in effect is only repeating to me what many Roman Catholics have put into print already: 'It is difficult to see how any conscientious Roman Catholic can take any sort of post in a modern printing or publishing concern, or work in a public library; for nearly all such concerns print or distribute forbidden books.'

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AS OTHERS SEE US

Hoover's First Year

Dr. MAX JORDAN, Washington correspondent of the *Berliner Tageblatt*, recently surveyed with an appraising eye the first year of the Hoover Administration. After analyzing the situation which led up to the stock-market depression and the present wave of unemployment he remarks:—

All these phenomena are accumulating in a year which is of great importance in terms of political strategy. In November the entire membership of the House of Representatives will come up for reëlection. At the same time the terms of office of a third of the senators who are now functioning will come to an end. The atmosphere of catastrophe comes to the Democrats like an answer to prayer. Times are undeniably bad. Let Hoover help the situation! Let the Republicans take this opportunity to demonstrate their vaunted art of government! No skill was needed to govern so long as the great economic machine ran by its own momentum. Coolidge had an easy time. The true test of ability is furnished by the present situation. It is up to the voters to decide which party deserves their confidence. As a matter of fact, the outlook is favorable to demagogues in all quarters.

The business depression is difficult to overcome, for uncertainty persists and cripples fresh initiative. Yet the Senate takes its own good time. Hoover's exhortations, prayers, and entreaties have been in vain. Instead of decisive action, the country has witnessed the independents in the Senate rushing to attack Hughes when Hoover submitted for confirmation the nomination of this greatest of living American jurists for the office of Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. In the minds of the opposition Hughes is the prototype of capital, the exponent of high finance, industry, and imperialistic expansion. Furthermore, he is looked upon as the representative of 'Toryism,' the strongly conservative tendency in the Republican Party. There was an astonishing pressure of objection to his appointment, and in the final voting the very considerable minority of 26, against 52, was ranged in a raging outburst of protest against the powers that be. Since that time the Republicans have been on the defensive.

Such protests are signs of the times, indications of a shift that is slowly taking place in the political thinking of the masses. They presage a new era of liberal-humanitarian characteristics which will prevail in the face of the materialistic attitude of the Government. Hoover's whole mental structure indicates that he belongs in this new epoch. It is really his. But it may be that he has appeared on the scene prematurely, too early to accomplish the great mission which has devolved upon him outside the field of domestic politics. The London Conference was to have been the touchstone for the soundness of his aspirations and the strength of his ideals. But the impulse responsible for summoning the conference was visionary in nature. The statesmen are again obliged to disappoint their people because vision has once more outstripped the actual development of events.

The first year of the Hoover Administration was a difficult one. The present year will also be difficult. Calvin Coolidge was not able to transfer his lucky star to his successor. America is now in a period of transition whose completion will not come about from one day to the next nor from one presidential term to the next. For the further development of the country much will depend upon the vigilance and keenness of perception of the present generation. Hoover stands on the threshold of a new era. He has the opportunity to prove himself a statesman of wide capacity. The world wishes him success.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A French History of America

TO APPEASE EUROPE'S insatiable curiosity in regard to America, Firmin Roz, the author of several books on English and American life, has just completed a history of the United States. He describes his task as follows in the columns of *Le Figaro:*—

For several years I have been working on a history of the United States of America that is just being published to-day, and this work has led me, on more than one occasion, to reflect on the reason for the exceptional interest that this subject arouses in us at the present moment, and to consider how I should write about it. These two questions both rise out of a single condition that I shall endeavor to explain.

Looked at in the large, American history is a prodigious affair, since so much has been accomplished in so short a time. Within the limits of the modern epoch a nation has been formed in the New World with elements borrowed from the Old, and it has placed itself in the very front rank of the Great Powers. A people, too, has been born within less than three centuries, and it has extended its empire from the Atlantic to the Pacific over an expanse of territory almost as large as Europe, and it has also spread its influence over two oceans, from the Antilles on the one hand to the Philippines and the China Sea on the other. To-day this people is unquestionably the most active, the richest, and the happiest in the world, and has an unalterable confidence in itself that is well justified by events. It cultivates a legitimate pride in its past and unlimited hopes for its future. It looks down on Europe, whence it came, and regards the Old World not without a certain disdain as being a group, not to say a jumble, of aging, worn-out, quarrelsome nations that have long since played their part and perhaps fulfilled their destiny and who should now give way to its own youthful forces, ambitions, and infinite resources.

The history of the American people is not shrouded in the mists of antiquity. It is recent and relatively short. All its facts and characters are known. In establishing the sequence of events and the actions of men we do not need to explore archives, exhume unpublished documents, rearrange a doubtful chronology, or interpret dubious witnesses. All our materials are ready to hand, easy to utilize. Nor is this all. They have already been utilized time after time and in many forms by American and foreign historians and biographers.

The history of the United States certainly does not lack picturesque qualities and it is never devoid of grandeur, for underlying it all is a prodigious atmosphere of adventure. But it is even more necessary for us to understand than to contemplate and admire. We must make ourselves see the history of the American people with clear eyes and study how the nation first established itself and then came to affirm its power more vigorously day after day. In order to do this, we must classify our facts in as orderly a fashion as possible, picking out the most important ones and then deciding how much emphasis should be placed on circumstance and how much on human action. This is the only way to discriminate between the essential and the accidental, the temporary and the permanent.

The last word in the history of the United States has not yet been written, for it is the history of a people still on the make, of a society that is still organizing itself. The American people, composed as it is of various dissimilar elements, has not yet achieved homogeneity, and Americanization is still a most vital problem.

The astonishing success of the United States seems to be due to the activity of the constructive spirit working on a soil full of rich natural material and favored by two causes that cannot be overestimated, since both have been at work since the country's earliest days. The first of these is the formation of a political aristocracy, a class of men trained in self-government and accustomed to organizing more or less auton-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

omous communities. The second is the primacy of economic things, which exercise a kind of dictatorship. We therefore realize, when we consider the double influence that has been exercised on the American people, that democracy in practice has assumed a very different form from the one with which the word is invested in our current speech, and that, perhaps, is the principal lesson of American history.

Smoot and Smut

THE *MANCHESTER GUARDIAN* devotes a sharp little editorial to Senator Reed Smoot's efforts in behalf of literary censorship:—

It has taken the esteemed leader of Mormonism, Senator Smoot, two days' hard work to convince his fellow senators in Washington that the best judge of what the nation may read is the gentleman who ransacks your suitcase for silk, scent, or cigarettes. Censorship by customs officer seems a sufficiently astounding proposal, but it is the view of the Senate that the Old-World procedure of appeal to courts of law is of no use to a generation like ours. Senator Smoot was able to carry into the assembly of his colleagues a pile of supposedly salacious volumes which had managed to find free passage into American bookshops, and some other senators, refusing to take them as read, spent an energetic afternoon in getting first-hand knowledge of the subject. In the result they have struck this blow for the right, and if their will prevails no visitor to the United States will be able to carry a book in his luggage unless it is of such a kind that no customs officer is eager to read it. *King Lear* was mentioned as one of the deplorable sources of corruption which might sneak into America along with claret and cocaine, and it is true that in *King Lear* the author did make some remarks upon politicians and authority which are little calculated to gratify senatorial taste or to smooth the ruffled temper of Mr. Smoot. However, the Senate may reflect that it is being merciful. Not long ago in Texas a small boy was sent to a reformatory because he spent his pocket money on buying a copy of Shakespeare. If Senator Smoot has his charitable way, the youth of the nation will at least be saved from all such dreadful temptation in the future.

Jeritza on America

MARIA JERITZA, the Viennese opera star, has returned for a brief engagement to her native city, where she disclosed her optimistic views on modern America:—

Anyone who still looks upon America as merely an unenlightened country given over entirely to business makes a great mistake. The last few years witnessed widespread change, not only in the artistic field but in the whole mentality of the American citizen. Contact between Europe and America is growing closer all the time and to-day there is a regular exchange, chiefly in artistic productions, which is refining the taste of the American public and is giving new ideas to huge masses of people. Whereas art used to be looked upon as a form of business, people are now trying to separate these two activities, and art and literature are being regarded from quite a new point of view. Of course, this distinction does not go so far as to impel any theatrical producers to stage plays out of purely idealistic motives and thus ruin themselves commercially. The Americans have no hesitation in putting on sensational dramas that bring in large returns to the box office, but at the same time they also endeavor to present works of literary merit from the hands of unknown authors, provided they are not running too great a financial risk. In this way it is possible to educate the public gradually to an appreciation of first-class dramatic literature and to do away with some of the crook plays and similar sensational trash.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WAR AND PEACE

Armaments can never be viewed as an economic asset to a state. They must ever remain the unproductive exploitation of men and material and an encroachment on the economic reserves of a state through the temporary conscription of men in the active periods of their lives—not to mention the moral impairment resulting from a preoccupation with the profession of war and the moral processes of preparing a nation for it.—*Professor Albert Einstein, German scientist.*

A general limitation of armaments is undoubtedly to our advantage, but we have been steadily reducing our army without taking the armaments of others into account, and the result is that we shall enter the Plenary Disarmament Conference of the League of Nations, when it assembles, with no margin left for bargaining as far as our army is concerned. Some administrative economies may still be possible, but no statesman with any sense of responsibility can reduce our military establishments any further without first reducing the dangers which they may have to meet.—*Major General Sir Frederick Maurice, Director of Military Operations, British Imperial General Staff, 1915–1918.*

The foundations of peace in Europe depend on Franco-German and Polish-German coöperation. The Polish-German liquidation treaty, concluded in October last year, has settled all mutual financial differences and has removed all hindrances to a commercial agreement. —*Foreign Minister Zaleski of Poland.*

We must regard a warless world as a point of departure, not as a point of arrival.—*Wickham Steed, former editor of the London 'Times.'*

Neither on the sea, where several imperialisms are opposed to one another, nor on land, where Central and Oriental Europe are far from being consolidated, does the situation justify any lazy optimism. With its double determination, ofttimes affirmed, of peace and domination, our age contains as many murderous risks as those which have gone before.—*Senator Henry Bérenger, former French Ambassador to Washington.*

The French, who have so many armaments of every kind, live in a state of perpetual fear. The Germans, who have been literally disarmed, seem to be entirely free from fear. The moral—so obvious that it is never believed—is that armaments do not give even the illusion of security. That they do not give the fact of security all history teaches.— *'Manchester Guardian,' Liberal Daily, from a leading editorial.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED